

Religious Education

The Journal of The Religious Education Association

(Copyright, 1915, by The Religious Education Association)

VOL. X

AUGUST, 1915

No. 4

CONTENTS

TEACHING OF BIBLE IN COLLEGES

A SURVEY OF NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK AND OHIO	315
<i>Frank K. Sanders</i>	
A SURVEY OF THE COLLEGES OF IOWA	323
<i>W. Irving Kelsey</i>	
THE ESSENTIAL TRAINING OF BIBLICAL TEACHERS	327
<i>Charles F. Kent</i>	
WHAT CONSTITUTES A DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE	332
<i>Irving F. Wood</i>	
THE EQUIPMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE	337
<i>Laura H. Wild</i>	
THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF COURSES IN THE DEPARTMENT	345
<i>Luther A. Weigle</i>	
THE COLLEGE COURSE AND BIBLICAL WORK	351
<i>Alfred E. Alton</i>	
THE CONTENT OF AN IDEAL CURRICULUM	355
<i>Henry T. Fowler</i>	
THE CONTENT OF AN IDEAL CURRICULUM	362
<i>Ismar J. Peritz</i>	
THE FARGO PLAN	365
<i>Wallace N. Stearns</i>	
<hr/>	
CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BECOME SCIENTIFIC	368
<i>Benjamin S. Winchester</i>	
THE CITY SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTITUTE	377
<i>Walter S. Athearn</i>	
SUNDAY SCHOOL EVANGELISM	380
<i>Walter A. Snow</i>	
THE ORGANIZATION OF A CHURCH	385
<i>Paul Moore Strayer</i>	
THE LEND A HAND CLUB	386
SUNDAY SCHOOL EXAMINATIONS AND CERTIFICATE	388
THE PANAMA PACIFIC CONGRESS	391
COMMISSION ON GRADED WORSHIP	393
NEWS AND NOTES	396
BOOK REVIEWS	397

The Religious Education Association

IS THE FEDERATION, IN A COMPREHENSIVE ORGANIZATION, WITHOUT CREEDAL CONDITIONS, OF THOSE WHO SEEK TO PROMOTE AND IMPROVE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THE MEMBERSHIP includes ministers of religion, college presidents and professors, teachers and officers in public schools and Sunday schools; students, parents, educational officials, and social workers.

MEMBERSHIP OFFERS the advantages of fellowship, conference, co-operative effort, counsel and aid, the receipt of the publications, and the use of the bureau of information. It affords also an opportunity to sustain and advance the movement.

THE ASSOCIATION'S primary purpose is to stimulate, inspire, and assist. It serves as a center for leaders, a forum, a clearing house, a unifying, co-ordinating agency.

It conducts local conferences and general conventions.

It maintains a Library-Exhibit and a Bureau of Information.

It publishes volumes, free pamphlets and a magazine, "Religious Education."

THE ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP FEE is \$3.00. Members receive the current publications, including "Religious Education," free.

THE ASSOCIATION invites you to co-operation by membership.

The Religious Education Association
332 South Michigan Ave. Chicago

THE STANDARDIZATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

At the various sessions, last March, at Buffalo, of the Department of Universities and Colleges, so many of the questions of very great importance to those who are interested in the adequate development of true Biblical instruction in the institutions of higher education in North America were so finely treated that it has seemed worth while to gather the papers together, that they may receive the careful consideration which they richly merit.

The opening paper will indicate the tremendous need which still exists for the recognition of the rightful place of the Bible as an educational asset. The other papers deal with various phases of the standardization and development of a strong department, co-ordinate in aims, methods, standards and evaluation with the other recognized departments of a cultural institution. These papers deserve the close attention, not alone of deans and others who will consider them technically, but also of all who are eager to discover a program of Biblical instruction which may be conscientiously urged upon the educational leaders of North America. F. K. S.

TEACHING THE BIBLE IN COLLEGES

A SURVEY OF THE SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK AND OHIO

FRANK KNIGHT SANDERS, PH.D., LL.D.

Director of the Board of Missionary Preparation, New York City

It was the original purpose of a duly appointed committee of the Department of Universities and Colleges to present the conclusions of a nation-wide survey. This proving, for various reasons, unfeasible, I have undertaken a careful survey of a restricted area. The five New England states, New York and Ohio have been selected, because it seems fair to assume that the conditions prevailing in this older portion of the country in point of educational history are representative of the best conditions in North America. I am less certain that this assumption is correct than when I planned the survey, but submit the results as I have found them. The main objective of the inquiry has been the general attitude toward the use of the Bible as an educational asset in the institutions of higher

learning, but it has seemed worth while to take into account nine types of educational institutions: theological seminaries, state universities, endowed universities, colleges of arts and science, private secondary schools, public secondary schools (casually), training schools and schools of the Bible (which do a distinctively recognized work), normal colleges, normal schools.

These nine sorts of schools are considered solely from the standpoint of their apparent recognition of the Bible as an educational factor. Colleges of agriculture, technology, medicine, law, and schools for the professional training of women and other non-religious professional schools are not included.

No survey can be exact without personal contact with each institution. I have taken every available means to verify the following statements, but will welcome corrections or modifications.

BIBLE CONDITIONS IN MAINE

In the state of Maine there is one theological seminary: Bangor. It offers good opportunities for the study of the English Bible under competent instructors, whose main interests, however, are apparently linguistic and theological. The State University at Orono offers no Biblical instruction. Nor do the state normal schools make any provision for the use of the Bible as an asset in education, although the act establishing them specifies that they shall "teach the fundamental truths of Christianity."

There are three colleges of liberal arts: Bates, Bowdoin and Colby. Bowdoin uses a small portion of the time of a competent instructor to offer three hours for one semester in Biblical History. Bates uses the whole time of a professor of Biblical Literature to offer courses which begin with the literary study of the Bible, include Oriental History and the History and Philosophy of Religion and allot three hours a week during junior year to Old and New Testament Literature. Colby, despite its religious foundation, makes no provision for Bible study on a par with other educational subjects.

There are ten private secondary schools which ought to make careful and worthy provision for organized Bible study. Of these, apparently, only two, Oak Grove Seminary and Maine Central Institute, deal with the matter in a dignified way. They require from all students one hour per week of graded Bible study. Even their standard seems low educationally.

It is clear that Maine is lamentably lacking in any well-balanced attempt to solve the problem of making the English Bible a cultural

asset. Bowdoin merely suggests a department, while Colby with Colby Academy, each founded for the very purpose of promoting Christian education, ignores the matter as completely as do the seven other academies.

CONDITIONS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire has no theological school and only one college of liberal arts. The State College is one of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Dartmouth College has a well-organized department of Biblical Literature with a professor giving his whole time to its development.

Of the eight private secondary schools, five: Phillips Exeter, St. Paul's, St. Mary's, Colby, and Kimball-Union make regular provision for a simple type of Bible study, taught by special instructors. The courses are not, apparently, well standardized or clearly differentiated from similar work in the Sunday school or in the Christian Associations, but they show a vast improvement over earlier conditions. Tilton, Robinson, and Sanborn Seminaries, as well as the two state normal schools, seem to ignore the subject.

New Hampshire sets a higher standard than Maine, but invites improvement.

CONDITIONS IN VERMONT

Vermont has no school of theology. At the State University a one-hour course on the literary interpretation of the Bible is offered under a competent, non-professional instructor. Of the two colleges, Middlebury and Norwich, the latter seems to be a school of technology. Middlebury, an avowedly Christian college, makes no regular provision for Biblical instruction, but, curiously enough, does offer such instruction during the summer session. The normal schools, like those previously mentioned, ignore Biblical study, but the five private academies, Vermont, St. Johnsbury, Troy Conference, Burrand-Burton and Montpelier require a definite course of Bible study, graded and taught by good instructors. As a state, however, Vermont does not rank high in respect to the recognition of the Bible as an educational asset.

CONDITIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS

In Massachusetts are seven schools of theology: Andover, Boston University, Crane, The Episcopal Theological School, the Harvard Divinity School, Newton Theological Institution and the New Church School. Of these the Episcopal School at Cambridge requires some English Bible study and provides amply for it, while

the others offer opportunities which vary considerably, Crane and New Church least of all.

Of the three universities, Boston University and Harvard University provide good courses, but not, apparently, real departments, while Clark University ignores the Bible educationally.

Thirteen colleges of liberal arts (not counting the Massachusetts Agricultural or Simmons, which are reckoned as distinctively professional institutions) maintain, on the whole, fairly good standards. The colleges for men almost balance. Amherst, the International Young Men's Christian Association College, and the American International College have regularly organized departments, while Clark College, Tufts, and strange to say, Williams, the cradle of missionary zeal in the past and with long-time traditions of religious earnestness, ignore the Bible as a source of culture. Of the six colleges for women, the only one which fails to provide generously and wisely for Biblical work is Jackson College for Women, affiliated with Tufts.

Of the twenty-five strong private secondary schools in Massachusetts, for either sex or for both sexes, only one, Worcester Academy, is without some provision for Bible study. I am informed that provision has been made for a Biblical department at Worcester this coming fall. The work done in these secondary schools needs some standardization, but is sincere and worth while, as far as it goes.

One training school, the Gordon Institute, affiliated with the Newton Theological Institution, offers, apparently, excellent opportunities for Biblical study under standard conditions. The nine normal schools of Massachusetts maintain steadfastly the tradition of inattention to the value of Biblical knowledge to the professional teacher.

In the old Bay State conditions are relatively good. The Bible is quite generally reckoned and used as a cultural means. This fact makes the exceptions more strongly marked. When Amherst, Harvard and Yale, no less than Brown and Dartmouth, maintain strong Biblical courses or departments, surely Clark and Williams are placed on the defensive for their neglect.

CONDITIONS IN RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island has Brown University, which has maintained for years a well-equipped, strongly developed department of Biblical Literature. Pembroke College for Women, affiliated with Brown, is likewise enabled to stress the cultural values of the Bible. Of the

two strong secondary schools, East Greenwich Academy offers Biblical work under a competent instructor; while the Moses Brown School, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is satisfied with the voluntary activity of its students in the devotional study of the Scriptures. This judgment may be a mistaken one, since the schools established by the Friends are usually noteworthy for honoring the Bible.

CONDITIONS IN CONNECTICUT

In Connecticut are three schools of theology: the Yale School of Religion, Berkeley Divinity School and the Hartford Seminary Foundation, each recognizing and meeting the demand for the mastery of the English Bible. The Hartford Seminary Foundation includes a missionary training school of the first rank, the Kennedy School of Missions.

The one real university, Yale, makes ample provision through a finely equipped and well-organized department for Biblical instruction and research, strengthened by correlated departments. The two colleges, Wesleyan University and Trinity College, offer courses under competent auspices. Neither seems to set apart a professor for the purpose, as it should.

There are twelve first-rate secondary schools, each dealing seriously with Bible study except the Connecticut Literary Institute, founded by Baptists at Suffield for the express purpose of insuring to youth a distinctively religious education. The four normal schools and the agricultural school are true to Biblical form in their respective classes.

NEW ENGLAND AS A WHOLE

There are eleven theological schools, each of them recognizing in some measure the necessity of providing for the mastery of the English Bible by theological students. Only a few of these have an actual department of the English Bible. Four out of the six universities and fifteen out of the twenty colleges of liberal arts recognize generously the cultural value of the Bible, while forty-seven out of the sixty-one important private secondary schools provide graded courses and trained instructors. The seventeen or more normal schools and the dozen or so professional schools ignore the Bible as any basis of valuable instruction.

CONDITIONS IN NEW YORK STATE

There are six theological seminaries, each one making, directly or indirectly, generous provision for English Bible study.

Of the four universities only one, Syracuse, has established a real department of Biblical study. Columbia, Cornell, and New York Universities provide a little instruction from their own faculties, but not in any adequate fashion. Columbia recognizes the instruction given at Union Theological Seminary, but this provision touches the undergraduate life of Columbia but slightly, if at all. Of the fifteen colleges of liberal arts only four, Colgate University, the University of Rochester, Vassar College and Wells College, dignify the work of Biblical instruction. The other four colleges for women, Barnard, Elmira, Keuka and William Smith are far behind most institutions of their class in this respect. Barnard College has announced the establishment of a Biblical department next fall. The other colleges, including Adelphi, Hobart, Packer, St. Lawrence, Union, St. Stephen's and, curiously enough, Hamilton, with its wealth of puritan traditions, virtually ignore the cultural values of the Bible.

Teachers College of Columbia University is exceptional among institutions for the training of teachers, in that it recognizes the importance of Biblical training to members of the teaching profession and provides for it through reciprocal relations with Union Theological Seminary. The other seven normal institutions of the state ignore the Bible. There are nine first-rate private secondary schools, each without exception requiring Biblical work and making fair provision for it. There are six missionary or Bible training schools which make due provision for the mastery of the Bible. New York State as a whole invites encouragement.

CONDITIONS IN OHIO

In Ohio there are six theological schools, only one of them, Oberlin, contributing directly to the solution of the problems of English Bible instruction. The other five are wedded to the old-fashioned theological curriculum and modify it but slightly.

The two state universities support departments of Biblical Literature. So do the three private universities, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh and Western Reserve, the first two very meagerly but really.

There are twenty-seven colleges in Ohio, each recognizing the cultural value of good work done upon the Bible. Possibly one should except Lebanon University, Capital University at Columbus (which offers plenty of Biblical instruction but chiefly of the catechetical variety, favored by strict Lutherans), or Marietta College, which belittles its time-honored traditions by providing only that Freshmen shall study the Life of Christ for six weeks, under a non-faculty instructor, at the beginning of the college year. Two train-

ing schools at Cincinnati and at Wooster are each well equipped Biblically.

At Lakewood, a suburb of Cleveland, an interesting experiment is being tried out this very year, which promises to throw much light upon the vexed question of the recognition of the Bible in public high schools. Under the joint auspices of the public school authorities and of the ministers of the vicinage, an apparently successful attempt is being made to provide a credit course in Old Testament History and Literature in the Lakewood high school. The requisite conditions of a suitable course of study, a trained teacher and standard methods, are satisfied, and general approval seems assured. Perhaps this experiment will demonstrate the entire feasibility, the great value and the absolute absence of factional religious suggestion in good courses for secondary schools on the history and literature of the Bible.

Ohio has many normal schools, but I have been unable to determine whether they find a way of recognizing Biblical instruction. It has a few private secondary schools of high rank. Concerning them I have no accurate information.

A GENERAL SUMMARY

Within these seven states are twenty-three theological institutions, of which all but five recognize the importance of giving virile, historical instruction in the English Bible. The excepted institutions are either ultra-conservative or the very opposite. The former do not ignore the Bible but fear to trust it; the latter do not value its mastery. Of the five universities (including Cornell) which are wholly or partially state universities, three find no difficulty in recognizing the English Bible as a real factor in education. There are twelve universities unsupported by public taxation. About half of them give full recognition to the Bible as a cultural asset. Sixty colleges of liberal arts are reported, of which more than forty give a reasonable place in their regular schedules to the English Bible. The only discouraging fact is that such colleges as Bowdoin, Middlebury, Colby, Clark, Williams and Hamilton should be counted among the twenty whose responsible officers have not seen fit to make available to their students adequate opportunities for the historical study of the Bible. Of the seventy secondary schools of first rank, fifty-six give ample recognition to the Bible.

In the institutions thus reviewed are to be found a considerable body of specialists in Biblical instruction. Out of over one hundred and sixty registered instructors in the English Bible, not a few are

real leaders, responsible for the gradual but significant growth of the years since 1887, when Professor Harper gave the first great impulse toward historical Bible study in this country. The Biblical teachers of the whole country have become quite an army, five hundred and fifty strong, at the last count. There should be about one thousand more.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE DATA

1. While this report of current conditions shows that the recognition of the Bible in English is firmly established in a majority of our representative institutions, there is still ahead of us a genuine work of pioneering. Its justification in university and college alike requires no argument; its thorough establishment in an important group of colleges is desirable.

2. With few exceptions the aggressive and important secondary schools recognize the value of Biblical instruction. Their actual programs seem in need of standardization. There is little or no correlation apparent between the work they attempt and that which belongs to college years.

3. The normal schools are practically unreached. They are obsessed by the idea that the Bible is necessarily a sectarian and divisive book. Hence they cut out all opportunities for their students to gain that general acquaintance with the history and literature of the Bible which would enable them to understand its broadly helpful use in character formation and the acquisition of ideals. Their problem is a part of the larger problem of the use of the Bible in tax-supported schools, yet unsolved in our country.

4. More important just now than the work of pioneering is an increase in the number of competent teachers, trained for Biblical teaching, who know how to make it a real educational asset. It is very evident to any impartial observer that even yet in many parts of North America the standards of competency in Biblical teaching are far too low.

5. Quite as important as the development of an adequate number of well-trained, enthusiastic teachers of the Bible is a departmentalizing of their task, which will set each teacher apart for this specific work. The valuable Biblical instructor must have the Bible as his dominant interest. Its successful teaching is an arduous and far-ranging task. The greatest handicap of the Biblical teacher's professional work today is that so many of them are expected to do other tasks as well.

6. The fourth great need revealed by such a survey is the stan-

dardization of the work to be done in each type of institution. There is a certain general task in Bible study which belongs properly to the secondary school, another which fits the normal school, quite another challenging the undergraduate college world, and another still which meets the needs of graduate and professional students. These tasks are measurably different from those which face the leaders of voluntary Christian activity in all these types of institutions. They may require some adjusting or modification in case of tax-supported institutions.

The achievement of these results rests ultimately with such an organization as the Religious Education Association, which brings together those who are actually grappling with these problems in a practical way. Looking back to our beginnings, only a little more than twenty-five years ago, we may be justified in great hopefulness.

A SURVEY OF COLLEGES OF IOWA

W. IRVING KELSEY, B.D.

Professor, Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa

This survey includes the twenty accredited independent colleges in the state, the State University and the State College at Ames. The State Teachers College is omitted because it offers nothing in Religious Education.* Only curriculum work is tabulated. The term Religious Education is used in a broad way. The material is divided under the following sub-heads: Biblical History and Literature; Religious Education proper, including History, Principles and Methods; Religion, including History, Psychology, and Philosophy of Religion; Doctrine; Church History and Missions; New Testament Greek and Hebrew; and related subjects.

Only seven institutions offer anything in Religious Education proper. Coe offers two hours; Central three; Highland Park one and two-fifths in the summer quarter; the State University two; Cornell two; Grinnell, beginning with the present year, ten; and Drake twenty-three.

The semester hours offered in Biblical History and Literature are as follows: Coe 26; Central 22; Penn 27; Parsons 6; Drake 64; Luther none, but it should be noted that it has a strong course in its academy; Dubuque 12; St. Ambrose 12; Highland Park $5\frac{1}{2}$; Lenox 4; Iowa Wesleyan 4; State University 6; State College at

*The faculty has voted to introduce a course this fall.

Ames 4; Leander Clark 4; Ellsworth 7; Cornell 14; Upper Iowa 16; Morningside 8; Grinnell 12; Simpson 8; Buena Vista 8; Des Moines $2\frac{2}{3}$.

Courses in History of Religion, Comparative Religion, Psychology or Philosophy of Religion are offered in all but seven of the institutions.

Courses in Theism, Christian Evidences, or some other phase of doctrine are offered in all but eight; Church History and Missions in all but ten; New Testament Greek in all but five. Hebrew is offered in only four. Six institutions offer courses in related subjects.

Of the twenty-two colleges, fourteen require some of the subjects for graduation. The eight which do not are the two state institutions, Leander Clark, Ellsworth, Upper Iowa, Morningside, Grinnell and Des Moines. Coe requires of Freshmen four hours of Old Testament History and Literature, and of Sophomores four hours of New Testament History and Literature. Central requires of Sophomores five hours of Biblical History and Literature, and of Seniors three hours of Philosophy of Religion.

Penn requires of Freshmen two hours of the Life of Christ; of Sophomores two hours of Teachings of Jesus, and two in the Life of Paul.

Parsons requires of Freshmen two hours of Old Testament; of Sophomores two hours of New Testament; of Juniors two hours of Apostolic History and Life of Paul; and of Seniors two hours of Comparative Religion and Christian Evidences.

Drake requires of Freshmen four hours of Old Testament History, and of Juniors or Seniors four hours of one of the following: Psychology of Religion and Ethics; Philosophy of Religion; Church History; Apologetics, or Comparative Religion.

Luther requires seven in Luther's Catechism in the Freshman and Sophomore years; three in the Augsburg Confession in the Junior year; and four in New Testament Greek in the senior.

Dubuque requires of Freshmen two in Christian Doctrine, of Sophomores two in Church History, and of Juniors six in Sacred Scriptures in the A.B. course.

St. Ambrose requires sixteen in Christian Doctrine and eight in Church History.

Highland Park offers an option between a one hour course running through the first three years or a five hour course for one year. The subjects in the one hour course in the Freshman year are Hebrew History and Literature; New Testament in the Sophomore;

and Christian Evidences, Comparative Religion, Church History and Missions in the Junior.

Lenox has a one hour course running through four years: Freshman, Biblical Structure; Sophomore, Biblical Literature; Junior, Christian Evidences; and Senior, Christian Theism.

Iowa Wesleyan requires four hours in Biblical History and Literature of Juniors.

Simpson requires four hours in the Freshman or Sophomore years. Students can elect between the Old and New Testament. Most of them elect the former.

Buena Vista has a one hour course running through the four years. The first two years are devoted to the Old Testament, and the last two to the New Testament.

Cornell requires ten hours in Philosophy and Religion. A four hour course in Life and Teachings of Jesus is open to Sophomores; a six hour course in Old Testament, a four hour course in Apostolic Age, and a four hour course in Missions are open to Juniors; a three hour course in Philosophy of Religion is open to Seniors.

Leander Clark has no required work, but most graduates take courses in the Bible, Theism and Christian Evidences. As to the number who elect these courses in the other colleges where they are not required I have no data.

In all colleges where Biblical courses are required except Cornell, Central and Iowa Wesleyan at least part of the work is taken during the Freshman year. Cornell and Central start with the Sophomore and Iowa Wesleyan with the Junior years.

Practically all of the required work is in the department of Biblical History and Literature. The exceptions are St. Ambrose, Dubuque and Luther where Doctrine and Church History occupy prominent places. There are also a few scattering courses of required work in Philosophy of Religion, Comparative Religion and Christian Evidences in other institutions, amounting in all to nine hours. The aggregate in Biblical work is sixty hours.

Practically all the colleges offer work in Biblical History and Literature. A greater variety of courses is also offered than in any other line of religious education; one can almost say than in all other lines combined. We might deduce from this fact, coupled with the other, that almost all the required work is Biblical, that the institutions included in this survey consider this work of greater importance than that offered in the other departments of religious education.

As to the order in which the required work is given it may be

noted that the Old Testament is given first place except at Cornell and Penn, with an option between Old and New Testament at Simpson. Is this done on the ground of logical or historic sequence, or is it based on the assumption that the religious development of the individual corresponds to the religious development of the race? I raise the question, have not our programs been patterned after those of the theological seminary or a complete course in religious education, rather than to meet the actual needs of the great majority of students in a liberal arts college? Has not a theory of religious education dominated in the construction of our programs rather than the religious needs of young men and women in the Freshman year, many of whom are away from home for the first time, and are undergoing a trying intellectual, social and religious readjustment. The question is, what will contribute most to their future welfare under these circumstances?

In several cases all the required work is in the Old Testament. In nearly all cases this is given during the first two years of college life. It is a well-known fact that a large percentage of our students never get beyond the Sophomore year, and another fact that most students only take the required work in this department. My question is, are we considering the interests of the majority of students or of only those who are preparing for the ministry or work in religious education? I would not for a moment minimize the religious value of Old Testament History and Literature, but when students cannot have both would it not be better, on religious grounds, to give them the New Testament in the Freshman year? Moreover, the Life of Christ and the Life of Paul are splendid courses for giving to the student a method and point of view in Bible study, without raising the critical questions which naturally arise in a course in the Old Testament. My plea is for the average student who only gets one or two Bible courses. Is it not more important that he should become acquainted with Christianity rather than with Judaism, with Christ than with Isaiah, with Paul than with Jonah?

Where eight or ten hours of work are required both of these courses could be given. Even when there are only six hours three of them could be given to the New Testament by shortening both courses. My only suggestion is that the New Testament should not be entirely crowded out by the Old.

TRAINING THE COLLEGE TEACHER

THE TRAINING ESSENTIAL TO EFFICIENCY IN BIBLICAL TEACHING IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

CHARLES FOSTER KENT, PH.D., LITT.D.

Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature, Yale College

It is perfectly obvious that to place the Biblical instruction in our American colleges and universities on the same level of efficiency as that of other departments two measures are essential: first, to establish Biblical chairs in several hundred of our college institutions which at present in part or wholly lack that equipment; and second, to train carefully and thoroughly an equal number of our most promising students to fill these chairs. Vision, foresight, and appreciation of relative educational values, patience, and some generous giving in this field are imperatively needed and will beyond question bear most abundant fruitage.

The present situation here in America is most favorable for this forward step. The older dogmatic, theological interpretation of the Bible, with all its conflict and sectarianism, has passed into history. The critical, at first destructive but in the end constructive, period of Bible study, which has characterized the past quarter of a century, is just closing. The historical and literary analysis of the Biblical books is practically complete. The constructive conclusions that have come as the result of the application of modern scientific methods of study to the life and literature of the Bible are now readily accessible to all. The student of the Bible today feels no necessity of apologizing for his convictions to the scientist. The heated combats between a Huxley and a Gladstone have become as much a part of ancient history as the battles of the dogmatic theologians.

Today the Bible is being approached from many angles. Historical, literary, educational, and social interest in its life and literature is taking the place of the older theological and devotional, and the more recent critical study. With surprise and delight men are discovering that the Bible was originally written in order to appeal to these interests, which we are wont to recognize as distinctly modern. Today thousands and hundreds of thousands are reading and studying the Bible, not goaded by the sense of duty but because of the pleasure as well as profit that they derive from it. The evidence is clear that we are not at the beginning but in the midst of a great Biblical renaissance.

In this new and significant movement the colleges and univer-

sities, both because of their traditions and of their endowment, are called to assume the leadership. The Bible also represents one of the two great currents of ancient life and literature regarding which the modern educated man cannot afford to be ignorant. It is obvious, however, that our American colleges cannot lead effectively unless their equipment is commensurate with the demands of the situation. That they are not at present efficiently equipped is clear in the light of recently collected statistics. Certain colleges and universities stand forth as signal exceptions; but in a majority of our American educational institutions no subject in the entire curriculum is so frequently intrusted to partially or inefficiently trained instructors as the Bible. It is not strange that the enrollment is comparatively small. How long would the Greek classics or modern English literature hold their followers if the instruction in these subjects was farmed out as is so frequently done in the case of the Biblical classics? Certainly no subject, both because of its difficulties and its intrinsic importance, calls for more thorough and extended training on the part of the one who essays to teach it.

The Bible and its related writings almost equal in bulk the Greek or Latin classics. It comes from the ancient Semitic world, which is the opposite pole from our modern occidental life and thought. It represents twelve centuries of active human history and many varied departments of investigation: literature, history, archaeology, geography, sociology, ethics, and religion. It therefore demands in the one who would teach it exact, detailed and at the same time encyclopedic equipment. Better turn over the teaching of English literature or history to the professors of philosophy or mathematics than the interpretation of the Bible to instructors not definitely trained for this most difficult task.

We have made distinct progress in America during the past five years in defining and differentiating the functions of the Biblical departments in our American colleges, and all this has tended to save them from their greatest peril, namely that of becoming too encyclopedic. At conferences held in co-operation with the Religious Education Association and the Association of Collegiate Biblical Instructors in Preparatory Schools and Colleges, the respective fields of the work of the Christian Associations and the Biblical curriculum courses have been definitely mapped out. Practical co-operation between those who teach the Bible scientifically and those who teach it for personal inspiration is taking the place of duplication. The result is much profit to all concerned. It is also recognized that the task of the Biblical department is not to duplicate the work of the college

chapel, or of the "religious week" (which is becoming an important factor in our American college life), nor to relieve the members of the college faculties of their responsibilities in developing the religious and moral ideals and characters of their students. Rather its task is to lay exact historical foundations and thus to give the students practical knowledge of the contents of the Bible, to reinforce the work done by each of these other agencies. The primary function of the Biblical instructor is closely akin to that of his colleagues in other departments: he is to teach, that is not only to impart instruction but to inspire and direct the interests and investigations of his students in his special field; not to drill them in the contents of a textbook, but to introduce them to source books and guide them in the use of a carefully selected reference library.

In all Biblical work it is self-evident that the personal character of the instructor is of pre-eminent importance, but this does not alone qualify for efficient work; it is only the absolutely necessary foundation on which to build. In training the Biblical instructor of the coming generation, certain basal work must be done during his college course. In addition to a broad college training the candidate should lay special emphasis on Latin, Greek, and the two major modern languages. It is also important that he should begin his Hebrew during his college course. To these foundation studies he should add, as far as his time permits, courses in general history, literature, psychology, and sociology; for each of these subjects stands in close practical relation to his later work.

The hitherto prevalent confusion regarding the aims of the Biblical department is strikingly illustrated by the fact that a great majority of the present Biblical instructors in our preparatory schools, colleges, and universities have received their training in theological seminaries. This enlistment of seminary trained men is of course, partially due to the lack of thoroughly equipped Biblical instructors. It was perfectly natural that the colleges should draw from the group of those who had received a cognate training. In the case of the preparatory schools, it is because, up to the present, not Biblical but religious instruction and the direct development of moral character have been made the primary aim of the Biblical curriculum as well as of the voluntary courses. Far be it from me to disparage the devoted, valuable work now being done by seminary trained men and women; but it is clear that, if the Biblical instructors of the future are to perform their function and to gain full recognition for their work in the college and university world, they must be trained in the university and with a more definite focus on their specific task.

While closely related, the tasks of the preacher and the college teacher are distinct. When this simple fact is fully recognized, we shall have made much progress in solving the problem of Biblical instruction.

In this paper we are endeavoring to define, not the minimum amount of training which will enable a man of large native ability and enthusiasm to interest a college class, but the minimum of equipment which will also enable him to do justice to his subject and worthily to satisfy the rigorous demands of the college and student world. The nature of the Biblical material makes it practically imperative that he shall be a thorough master of the three languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Hellenistic Greek, in which the books of the Bible were originally written. I recognize that there is a strong tendency in this rushing age to sidestep this fundamental requirement, but I am convinced that it cannot be done without serious, yes, fatal, loss in efficiency. Most of the Biblical instructor's teaching will necessarily be done on the basis of English translations, but he can never appreciate in their fullness and beauty the thought of the Biblical writers until their words appeal to him as they uttered them in their original tongue. He himself should also personally know the baffling difficulties and the exquisite joy of endeavoring to interpret the noble thoughts of these ancient oriental teachers into the idiom and life of the modern West.

To a thorough working knowledge of these three Biblical tongues should, if possible, be added an acquaintance with at least one of the cognate Semitic languages with its literature; among these are Syriac, which stands in a close relation both to the Old and New Testament, or Arabic, which represents the mother Semitic tongue, or Assyrian, the key to a vast, important and fascinating literature. Few teachers of the Semitic languages are needed today in our American colleges; but we must have as Biblical instructors men and women who are able to stand squarely on these linguistic foundations and to teach the literatures which sprang from them with that assurance and enthusiasm which is alone begotten by exact knowledge. Otherwise their instruction must necessarily at many points be uncertain and lack that virility which is essential to college work. At least one-half of the time devoted to graduate work may therefore well be spent on the study of the Biblical books in their original tongues and of the languages and literatures most clearly related to them.

The Biblical instructor must also be acquainted with the modern historical and literary methods of study and with the important re-

sults which have been derived from their applications of the Bible. It is also equally important that he put this knowledge down into the foundations and not let it obtrude too much in college class room; for, while the college student today is quite ready to accept the constructive conclusions, he is not interested in the critical processes of Bible study. Far more important for use in the class room is the art of literary appreciation and interpretation that will kindle the imagination and make the significant characters and the great truths of Biblical history and literature a living reality in the minds of the students. To this end he must be familiar, not only with the facts of Biblical history, but also with the larger Semitic background. An intimate acquaintance with Biblical geography and its close relation to the history, and with the rich contributions of Semitic archaeology, adds greatly to his power of interpreting vividly and concretely the Biblical life and literature, and therefore must be reckoned as essential. He must also be able to trace historically the development of Israel's conception of God and of man's relation and obligations to Him, and the culmination of that development in Christianity. If to this he can add a knowledge of the history of the other important religions, it will not only broaden his vision but greatly enhance his ability to interpret the marvelous religious development recorded in the Bible. In many colleges, where special provision is not made for teaching the history of religions, the responsibility of giving instruction in this important field will doubtless fall to the Biblical department. The Biblical field itself, however, is so broad and daily growing broader, that it is doubtful whether one man, however thorough and extensive his preparation, can as a rule do justice even to closely related subjects and escape the perilous shoals of superficiality.

The Biblical instructor of the future must certainly be equipped to interpret historically and practically the wealth of social teachings which fill the Old and New Testaments and vastly increase the interest and value of the Bible to the modern age. The study of the educational values and use of the Biblical material also falls within the immediate field of Biblical instruction. To appreciate the point of view and aims of the great teachers of Judaism and Christianity, the instructor must have a definite knowledge of the principles of modern psychology and education. The fact that the Bible was primarily written with a teaching purpose and will undoubtedly remain for generations to come the chief textbook in all moral and religious teachings, explains why the tendency is so strong and so natural in many colleges to include courses in religious education in the Biblical

department. Obviously, in the larger colleges and universities these allied subjects should be taught by different instructors with a widely different training, but in the smaller colleges it is almost absolutely essential that the Biblical instructor should have a practical working knowledge of the methods and principles of religious education.

This general survey of the practical task of the Biblical instructor at least makes it very clear that his training must be both broad and deep, and that it should be of the type which leads to the university degree of either M.A. or Ph.D. Three years of graduate work are scarcely long enough to enable even the well prepared student to cover the entire field. It is quite essential, therefore, that he lay well the foundations on which he is to build in connection with his later teaching work. As a college instructor, he may and should do some technical research work in a chosen limited field; but today in most of our American colleges his task is primarily to teach. He must be keenly alive to the proportionate interests and values of his department as a whole, and must plan his courses not theoretically but with a clear appreciation of the time limitations and needs of the average college man and woman. In a word, what our American colleges need today in a Biblical instructor is a thorough and technical training in the fundamentals of his subject, and at the same time a readiness and ability to adapt his courses and teaching to the point of view and interests not only of the special but of the general student.

WHAT CONSTITUTES AN IDEAL DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

IRVING FRANCIS WOOD, PH.D.

*Professor of Biblical Literature and Comparative Religion, Smith
College, Northampton, Mass.*

As I interpret the theme, it means that we should consider the standards and the objective of our department. The Biblical department in a well equipped American college has one great advantage over every other department. It is so new that it has no traditions. Nobody knows what a Biblical department can do. Nobody has a right to demand that it should do any particular thing. If the Latin department did not teach Horace to the freshmen, all the old fellows among the graduates would begin to talk about academic degeneracy. The old fellows have no standards by which to hold up

the mirror to the Biblical department. This situation has its disadvantages. Experience is worth something after all, and probably we Biblical teachers have made more blunders in proportion to our numbers than the teachers of any other subject.

Let me acknowledge that a part of the ideal situation lies outside of our control. It is the atmosphere in which we work. That atmosphere must be one of freedom. No other department in college can be hampered so easily as ours. We must be free to represent Biblical scholarship as it actually exists in the scholarly world. Now many of us are seldom troubled in this respect. A college in these days rarely wants to put in a department of Biblical literature unless it intends to give this freedom. Most of us can win all the freedom that is good for us. I doubt if any person ought to be in a college chair of the Bible who cannot give an address that is perfectly honest, and yet will rouse enthusiasm in an audience that "doesn't want any of this modern stuff."

Coming now to the internal college conditions of the department:

1. The number of the teachers should be adequate to the work they undertake. That seems at first sight too obvious to need statement, but there are colleges where it applies. In some institutions there was, in the old days, a traditional Bible course, given once a week, often in the form of lectures, and not making heavy demands upon either students or teachers. Later, when a department of Biblical Literature had been organized, these courses, often excellent of their sort, were changed into class work with its more exacting demands, but no teaching force adequate to meet the demands was provided.

2. Teachers ought not to be so many that they have to multiply courses to keep busy. Graduate and professional schools have another problem, but I believe that for undergraduate work, the wisest plan is to offer comparatively few courses—those which have proved themselves to fit the special needs of that particular college community, and to make those courses as strong as possible. A strong force rather than a large force; a few highly esteemed courses rather than a multiplicity of courses, only half known to the student body—these seem to me to be the ideals. Of course when a new teacher is making his way, feeling out the situation, he ought to experiment somewhat widely, but when he has discovered his situation, then I believe that he ought to delimit his work rather sharply, though of course he must not be impervious to new ideas.

3. The Biblical teacher must be specially well equipped. This is all the more necessary because there is no traditional structure of the

subject, upon which the teacher of the Bible can lean. He must know enough to build his own house. Teachers can succeed, and succeed admirably, in most of the old subjects with an equipment that means failure in Biblical chairs. The teacher of mediocre equipment simply has no place in Biblical work. It calls for able, broadly trained men and women; not that nobody except the most highly trained university students with a Ph.D. ought to be appointed to Biblical chairs, but teachers ought not to be appointed who will not at least make an effort to obtain all the educational equipment they can.

4. The Biblical teacher must possess a considerable measure of personality. More than half of the success of all college teaching depends upon the personality of the teacher. The success of the Biblical department is particularly dependent upon it. The students come, for the most part, with no predispositions in favor of Biblical study. You will hear the freshmen talk about how they want to study English, or their fathers want them to give some attention to German, or their older brothers think they ought to take all the economics the college offers; but they do not often come with a predetermination to learn what they can about the Bible. In the college a tradition of the excellence of a certain course can be built up, but it must be largely built on the personality of the teacher. Now I am well aware that this subtle thing we call personality is not to be bought with a doctorate, neither shall midnight oil be burned for the price thereof, but I believe that a moderate gift of it may be increased. After all, the most abiding type of personality in the teacher comes from a determination to enter into a sympathetic relation with his students, and to be able to see things from their point of view, whether it be their last joke on him, or their puzzle over how to reconcile evolution with belief in a God, or anything else, even though it seems to him ancient history.

We need teachers of strong personality especially because of the specious familiarity of our students with the Bible. The work of the Sunday school places a great burden on the college teacher of the Bible. It goes through the Bible and clips off the edge of interest. The student knows just enough about the Bible to spoil his enthusiasm for its study. I wonder what a college class in Shakespeare would do if the students had undergone Sunday school teaching in that subject. We all know what a delightful experience it is to get a student who has never been in a Sunday school, knows nothing about the Bible, and comes to it as to something really new. I am not to be understood as opposing Sunday schools. We ought to help

them all we can; but we must face the conditions in which they place us. Such conditions demand a very fine persuasive personality to induce general interest in Biblical teaching.

5. The ideal Bible department will try to offer some courses outside of strictly Bible work. Bible study impinges upon three or four surrounding fields. It is not unique in that respect. Most subjects do the same. But in the Biblical field, most of these related subjects are not taught by any other department. It is the duty of the Biblical department to take up at least some of them if it can. Among them are Hebrew, New Testament Greek, ancient Oriental History, early civilization, early Christian development, the History of Religion, that contemporaneous history which consists in the interpretation of present day life on its religious side and religious education. I am sure that our Biblical work will be better if we are trying to do something in some of these lines. No one outside the department can tell what a particular institution should do. It depends partly on the needs, still more on the tastes and training of the several teachers.

To one caution we must give heed; we must not allow ourselves to be cajoled or bullied into giving too many courses, nor courses we are not prepared to handle. For example, there is, so it would seem, soon to be a wave of interest in religious education. If taught at all, this subject should be taught well. Those of us who ought not to teach it must not allow ourselves to be pushed into it, simply because it is a fad. It is a great subject, and there ought to be teachers thoroughly trained to cover it, but I do not see that the ordinary teaching of Biblical literature is in itself any more a preparation for handling it than is the teaching of psychology. In fact, I think that the subject belongs properly to the department of education. A few Biblical teachers are teaching it admirably. More will do so in the future. But let no one claim that it is one's duty to do it because he is teaching the Bible.

Much the same is true of the History of Religion which usually commands great interest among students. But it is a subject of vast reach. The best prepared person feels like a child playing on the sands of the shore. The ideal teacher of it should know by personal and intimate association at least one religion outside of Christianity and Judaism. The Bible teacher is concerned in his normal work with the history of one religion, and that, too, one which abounds in illustrations of the evolution of religion. But that of itself by no means fits him to teach the History of Religion. It furnishes very little help toward the understanding of Hinduism or Confucianism.

Our department ought not to take up this subject unless we are prepared to do something worth while in it through sympathetic interpretation of the great religions. But in spite of these cautions, I still feel that the department which does not enter upon some of these related fields is missing a great opportunity. We can usually do something worth doing that will be undone unless we do it.

6. The department should have some unified point of view. Like the point of view of the Bible itself, this should be practical and not merely literary. The work of the department as a whole ought to aim to accomplish some result for its students. Within this general point of view of the department, the various teachers will naturally have their special fields, but each one should know definitely what he is trying to do for his students, not only in each course, but in his courses as a whole. I see no reason why a department should not have an aim in life as well as a person.

7. A Biblical department ought to connect its work with the life of the present day. It may do this by definite courses, such as historical courses in the development of Christian thought, or courses in the interpretation of present religious thought. Whether it gives special courses or not, however, two results should be attained: first, such a sympathy with modern life and its problems that the students shall know the department lives in the present and not in the past; and, secondly, such a use of the material of each course that the students will realize they are not studying religious archæology. Unless our Biblical studies have some bearing on present life, I think we would do well to close up our departments and pass the English Bible over to English literature. This ideal does not mean preaching in the classroom. We will realize in these days that the Biblical classroom is a place for the keenest possible academic work. But in the course of that work we frequently come face to face with some great idea, standing across our path, which has a direct bearing on the life of to-day. The prophets naturally raise the question whether there is any prophecy to-day; Job compels the question whether present thought has any better solution for the puzzles of life. Our work is full of points of contact with the present.

8. The ideal department will be interested in the religious life of the college. The students will naturally look to it for help in their religious activities; they ought never to look in vain. At the same time, we need to be exceedingly careful not to intrude, not to take responsibilities which students themselves should carry, and especially to keep out that last and slyest devil which haunts all so-called religious activities, professionalism. The teacher is not help-

ing the students in their religious work because he is a teacher of the Bible, but because he is genuinely interested in them and in what they are doing.

9. The ideal Biblical department will do something for the community outside the college. This department, more than most, can make a contribution to the life of the town, and it ought to take such activity as a part of its duty. Doubtless the professor of archaeology feels as cordial toward the surrounding community as the professor of Biblical Literature, but the latter can better express his desire to be of aid, and it is his duty, and should be his pleasure, to do it.

Doubtless few departments of Biblical literature attain their ideal standards, but these statements express what all are striving to reach.

THE EQUIPMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

THE MINIMUM OF EQUIPMENT ESSENTIAL TO THE RECOGNITION OF A DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

LAURA H. WILD

*Professor of Biblical History and Literature, Lake Erie College,
Painesville, Ohio*

In considering the standardization of the Department of Biblical Instruction in our colleges it must be remembered that Bible study has not been in the past upon just the same footing as other academic subjects. The religious value of the Bible has been so much in the foreground that it has overshadowed every other consideration of its place in serious study. This has brought with it a certain advantage in that the Bible has held a unique position of respect in the minds of most people, but it has also hampered its free course as an academic study in two ways. First, religion has been supposed to be taken care of by other agencies than the curriculum, and, secondly, the method ordinarily employed by those other agencies in treating the Bible has obscured its rich value as a part of the world's greatest literature and as affording the best of academic discipline.

Because the Bible has thus been regarded in the past there are two decided trends in the wrong direction in many of our colleges where Biblical instruction is given. The first of these is the old idea that, of course, students should know about the Bible, but that any good Christian person with ordinary intelligence and devotion

is quite capable of teaching it. This idea is fast passing away. The old method of having Bible study farmed out to four different professors of other departments, one for each college class, and the work assigned for one hour a week, is already almost defunct. But in some quarters the one hour a week idea still survives, and the opinion continues that it can be handled by someone whose main business is to teach another subject. No Biblical instruction so conducted should be considered as coming within hailing distance of recognition as a department. The reasons are very obvious. No other academic subject, regarded of importance enough to be taught in college, is ever on a sufficiently dignified plane to claim the name of department when thus taught. It is only at most a frill in education. Even if it is granted college credit, the method of instruction does not come up to departmental standards. No one-hour course can possibly produce the results that a three or four hour course accomplishes; and no one who teaches any subject as a side issue is likely to put into it his best work. This used to be the method of teaching English. But it has long since been relegated to the museum of antiquities so far as college standards are concerned. To-day any college would be open to ridicule that still clung to this old-fashioned way of teaching English and yet appropriated the name of English Department. We should not make an unwarranted exception of the Bible.

There is another tendency in the wrong direction that clings longer than this first one. In some quarters there is an idea that academic Bible study may well be coupled up with Christian Association work. This is the old notion that special religious agencies should take care of Bible study. The Christian Association has its distinct place in college life, but the minute it steps out of its place it either defeats its own aim or else it belittles the place it is assuming. The distinctive aim of the Christian Association is to be a religious agency emphasizing supremely the devotional side of life. Bible study in the Christian Associations is frankly recognized as putting that phase foremost. Even supposing a young man or woman could be employed as a Y. M. or Y. W. C. A. secretary, who was capable by training and tastes to teach the Bible with the strong intellectual grasp which all subjects in the college curriculum demand, if that person were true to his primary calling of a Christian Association secretary, it would be the religious and devotional side of the teaching which would receive major emphasis. Moreover the very fact of curriculum courses being coupled up with distinctly religious agencies would give the impression to all con-

cerned that they were not of the same character as ordinary academic courses. This obviously does not mean any disparagement of Christian Associations and their needed and most admirable work; nor does it overlook the great advantage obtained when the Christian Associations back up the curriculum courses, using their influence to arouse interest in them; nor does it depreciate the efforts made in some quarters by the Christian Associations in alliance with influential church agencies to establish a chair of Biblical instruction, especially in our state universities, this chair to be occupied by a trained scholar. But any instruction worthy to claim the name of a department in an academic institution must be stamped by its academic character first and foremost. The secretary of a Y. M. or Y. W. C. A. should not be employed to teach academic classes. Therefore such colleges as depend upon either of the above methods in their Biblical instruction should not be considered as maintaining a true department of Biblical Literature.

What, then, are the absolute requisites? There are two main distinctions which it seems to me should be insisted upon. First, there should be at least one instructor whose sole business shall be Biblical teaching. That is, he is to be an expert in this line. No other work is to take precedence over or even to be on an equality with this so far as his time and energies are concerned.

The objection which will be raised by some of our smaller institutions is that where the students are few in number it is too expensive to employ an expert for the few hours of work in Bible, especially if the training required in some other department seems to correlate nicely with that required for Bible study. For example, Greek and Bible, or Philosophy and Ethics and Bible, have often been grouped together. Very often the president himself, who has been a minister, keeps his hand on the teaching side of things by conducting the Bible classes. Why not? Well, in the first place the whole range of Biblical interpretation is such a vast field that if the Greek professor attempts to handle it properly, even in a sufficiently scholarly manner to give an adequate impression to beginners, he will find that the Greek point of contact is only one angle of approach; and if he overemphasizes that side, as a Greek professor is most likely to do, the whole viewpoint is lop-sided. The same thing is true of Philosophy and Ethics. Comparative Religions is of course very closely allied to Philosophy, but the study of comparative religions is the final fruit of Biblical study. So very much must precede as a foundation, that so far as the Biblical department is concerned it should be reserved as one of the higher

electives, save as an instructor's knowledge in that line helps his interpretation of Biblical history and literature. It would be much more reasonable to couple up the History or Literature departments with the Biblical instruction. But there are two arguments against that. These departments as a rule have already more than they can do in a small college and the instructors themselves are for the most part sadly lacking in Biblical vision. When Biblical Literature is prescribed as a minor for one who is majoring in English Literature preparatory to teaching it, the case may assume a different aspect.

The fashion of turning over Biblical instruction to the president of a college is fast disappearing, largely because ministers are no longer the sole incumbents of the presidential office. Even when a trained minister does hold the position, his administrative functions are as a rule too absorbing to allow him to give the kind of steady attention to an academic class which a competent instructor must give. This is usually true also of clergymen called in from the town to take a Biblical class. A clergyman's first business is his church work, even though he may be a scholar. If there are too many classes for one instructor to handle, it might be allowable to call in the assistance of a scholarly clergyman, but the burden of building up interest in the Biblical department should never rest upon his shoulders, for the simple reason that he is an outsider with his main interests elsewhere. And it must be remembered that since the student body is a constantly shifting entity, the building up and holding of interest in any department is a continuous process. And once more to compare the treatment of Bible study and other subjects which are dignified enough to demand a department to themselves, the time is fast passing when any two such subjects can be grouped under one head. The old-fashioned settee which our fresh-water colleges substituted for a chair in the early days of their history is being relegated to the lumber room. Even Chemistry and Physics, and Latin and Greek demand separate instructors. Experts are required for each subject.

But the question arises: How can a small college afford an expert for Bible alone when the hours are necessarily few, and will that expert be contented, if he is a person eager for business? Anyone who knows our field thoroughly will be amused at even the suggestion of such a question, for there is plenty to do in building up a Biblical department even in a small institution, and an alert instructor will find it. I have been told that the department of English Bible in our theological seminaries is one of the most difficult

in which to arouse and hold interest, just because the students assume that they know the English Bible already and will not need to work hard. College Bible has also had the reputation in some places of being a "snap," but it is no "snap" if the instructor does what he ought to with it. Moreover there is no other department in college, unless it be that of Sociology, that can so readily connect up with the needs of the surrounding community. Courses of lectures upon the modern appreciation of the Bible and training classes for Sunday school teachers are in demand and will be more and more according to present indications. This connection with the outside world is of benefit both to the institution and to the instructor himself, to say nothing of the community.

Therefore, for all these reasons we would say that at least one whole instructor is not an exorbitant demand if Biblical instruction in college is to be dignified by the name of a department. This requisite, however, is not at present generally met. In the statistical investigation made two years ago by the national organizations of Christian Associations there are to be found only fifty-two institutions employing the whole time of one or more instructors and one hundred and seventeen employing part time only.

The second distinctive characteristic of a Biblical department should be as regards the nature of the instruction. A college has not a real Biblical department unless Biblical history is upon the recognized plane of history instruction of college grade, and unless Biblical literature is treated with the same scholarly acumen that English or German literature receives. There may still be so-called colleges which approach history and literature from the secondary school point of view, which take one textbook and trot along obediently in the footsteps of the author, as if his words were the oracle of the gods beyond which no further investigation is necessary. Where this is the case, they are ruled out in our consideration. Perhaps this method is not employed in Biblical instruction in many colleges, but in order to make this second requisite clear it is necessary to analyze it a little further.

The study of the Bible may be approached fundamentally from two angles, that of history and that of literature. How is the study of history pursued in a real college? First, from the standpoint of information the college student must grasp the view of the evolution of history rather than simply to learn events and dates. The beginnings of things and the steps of progress, the relation of cause and effect, in other words the philosophy of history enters into his conception. The relation of different movements and races, the

racial significance of certain discoveries and inventions, the international significance of racial expressions of genius are dwelt upon. The college student is taught to look upon history from the large point of view. He gains sweeps of vision. And he must with this broad landscape get a scientific viewpoint from cause to effect, whether his particular phase of interpretation be psychological or economic.

Again, the method of obtaining his information must be the scientific method. Here are certain documents. They are made to speak for themselves. This places the whole subject upon the plane of research work; that is, this is the method, even if the college is too small to pursue very extensive research. The student must work with many authorities at his hand and with at least some translations of the sources. He must make up his own mind concerning the pros and cons of differing points of view. He must not be dependent upon other people's interpretation. He must learn to go to the document itself and make his own interpretations, when the evidence is all in. These are the rudiments of true scholarly discipline, and this is what a college stands for. Of course it necessitates a library. But libraries to-day, sufficient for such work as this, are taken for granted in all higher institutions. Of course the insistence upon such a method in historical study is not for the purpose of turning out scholarly productions in freshman or sophomore year, but for putting the tools into the hands of the students and showing them how to use them. In addition to this historical approach the Bible must be handled as great literature. How is any literature taught according to college standards? There must be a knowledge of the forms of literary style and a comparison of degrees of perfection. There must be a valuation of these forms for the times and an estimate of their influence as mediums of expression for the life of a people.

Now the Bible lends itself wonderfully to these two types of treatment. In my own estimation there is no other group of documents, so easily accessible, which affords such possibilities in strictly historical discipline as the Bible, and so far as its literary value is concerned we have a unique collection of forms all the more valuable because different in many respects from our occidental literatures. We should, indeed, magnify our office as Biblical instructors, proving to other departments how much our work may help theirs from the standpoint of pure scholarly discipline. And we need to do this because of the long-time notion that the Bible is a Sunday school textbook carrying with it a Sunday school flavor. It has

been used so long as a point of departure for moral preachments that the very first task an instructor must face is to free it from this stigma and to raise it to the dignity of superior intellectual training.

Of course many people will ask immediately if we are not thus eliminating its religious value? By no means. If the Bible is allowed to speak for itself as history and literature, it carries with it its religious lessons. For example, no student can compare the two documents, the Biblical flood story and the Babylonian tale, without being impressed by the deep religious value of the former; nor can he read with intelligent literary interpretation the great Thunderstorm Psalm without feeling the impressiveness of the religious message. This is the way students wake up to the religious fascination of the Bible. We are therefore doing religion *per se* a great favor to hold Bible instruction upon this high plane.

There is also a further important argument for the use of this method. It is the only way it can be taught in our public schools, which of course includes the state university as well as secondary schools. To my mind the whole question of the introduction of the Bible once more into our school system is a question of whether public school teachers are able to let the Bible speak for itself, their part being an adequate historical and literary interpretation. Our colleges must be preparing the teachers who can do this. It takes college discipline; no church discipline is as yet sufficient unto the need.

For these reasons, because we need to magnify the importance of the Bible as a historical and literary discipline and because of the influence this is going to have upon the public schools, I, for one, should deplore changing the title with which our department has already gained much ground, this title of course being the Department of Biblical History or Biblical Literature, or both combined. It has been suggested that we might better use the name Department of Religious Education or some similar title covering the field of religion. This it seems to me would defeat our ends, even in trying to secure religious education itself. It is the value of the Bible as history and literature which must just now be emphasized, if we look only to the influence the department is to have within the college itself.

I would also advocate having the Bible required of all students, preferably in sophomore year. By that time a student has come to appreciate the college point of approach and if the work is done properly he will say when he gets to be a senior that he could not have afforded the loss of the mental discipline and insight which

Bible study gave him for what he undertook in junior and senior years. But if it is merely an elective it will naturally be only those few who are attracted to the Bible as a religious book who will be likely to elect the work. Most students before they come to college have not had any historical and literary awakening concerning the Bible. It is this awakening which the required class accomplishes with so many students, who then regard it as a new book and are fired with enthusiasm for it. One of the greatest joys in college teaching is to see a large sophomore required class change its point of view and wake up to the real significance of Bible study within the first three or four weeks of the year. If it is not required and the real character of the work discovered, those who are specializing in history and literature will probably never dream that the Bible courses have anything to do with their chosen field. And then we will lose one of our great opportunities to inoculate the coming high school teachers with the idea that they may legitimately introduce the Bible as literature and history into their work. It is not simply workers in church and Christian associations we want now to train, but teachers of history and literature. This will in the end reflect most advantageously upon the church Bible school and the specialized Christian work of the country.

All of this applies to colleges whose curriculum is aimed to be strictly cultural as well as to those admitting professional courses, for from our cultural colleges a great number of our teachers are drawn. Of course required work could not be expected of a state university, and colleges upon private foundations have here a distinct advantage. Moreover if the work is not required, it would seem hardly worth while to have a department at all in very many of our smaller colleges, the number electing it would be so few. But wherever the work is dignified by the name of department there should be enough hours offered, either required and elective or only elective, to equal the number prescribed for a major subject, so that if a student wishes to major in Biblical History and Literature he can do so. This can be done if necessary by offering alternating courses in successive years.

Finally, there is this consideration to be taken account of even by our larger institutions, in deciding both the name and the policy of the department. If we all of us move together in trying to build up the standards of Biblical instruction we can accomplish much more the country over than if we adopt different standards and policies. If for example, this section of the Religious Education Association together with the College Bible Teachers Association

which meets in New York during the Christmas recess, were to adopt a certain minimum standard and definite policy, it would do very much to bring the work all over the United States to the point where every institution would be proud to have such a department, rather than some neglecting the matter altogether and others being half apologetic towards it.

To sum up, then, this discussion of the minimum which should be essential to the recognition of a Biblical Department, I would suggest the following distinctive characteristics of such a department.

1. The department must be placed on a basis which is absolutely independent of all the specialized religious activities of the college.
2. It must have at least one well-trained instructor for the Biblical department alone.
3. It must be developed and rated on a plane with the history and literature departments, using the standard methods of teaching those subjects in college.
4. Its name should carry weight from its academic rather than its religious emphasis.
5. It should be a required subject for one year if possible, preferably in the sophomore year, with electives following.
6. The number of hours offered should equal the number prescribed for a major subject.

THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF COURSES IN BIBLICAL LITERATURE, RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND RELIGION.

LUTHER A. WEIGLE, PH.D.

Dean of Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota

The question, let us remind ourselves, refers to colleges. One's answer naturally depends upon his conception of the college and its function. *The college is not a professional school.* It does not exist to turn out engineers or teachers, lawyers, doctors, business men, clerks, mechanics or cooks, or even preachers, deacons, directors of religious education, Sunday school teachers or superintendents, ready to step immediately into profession, trade or occupation, and to succeed by the direct application therein of vocational principles and methods learned at college. Neither does it exist to shorten the student's subsequent period of professional training, if

such shortening is to be accomplished by dovetailing into the work of its junior and senior years a certain number of directly vocational courses, which are to be accepted by the professional school in lieu of its own. It is in short a college of liberal arts, and it has confidence in its own four years' course as a foundation for a later vocational training, which it does not itself seek to give. Professor Athearn has reported one college president's answer to his inquiry respecting professional courses in religious education to be: "Our courses are not intended to prepare our students to do anything." I can well imagine that I might sympathize with what he meant to say, amused as I may be at the words in which he put it.

Positively, three things stand out to my mind as fundamental aspects of the aim of the college of liberal arts:

1. It seeks to make its graduates better able than they would otherwise be, to master quickly the technique of a given vocation and to understand it in terms of its underlying principles.

2. It seeks to make its graduates better able than they would otherwise be, genuinely to possess, enjoy, and share life. It would help them to breadth and richness of experience, to an understanding of life's deeper meanings and to an appreciation of its real values and its permanent satisfactions.

3. What follows from the other two aspects: it seeks to fit its graduates for leadership in the affairs of life, leadership in service as in achievement, and in the art of living as in its toil.

Such a definition of the aim of the college is, I am well aware, familiar and obvious enough. Colleges have always professed some such ideals, sometimes broadly conceived and sometimes narrowly. In at least three respects, however, these ideals have been distinctly modified in our time:

1. We have come to define culture in terms of life rather than of convention. Time was when the word stood for books, dead languages, good manners, music, art,—for all the delicate embroidery of life and for what the irony of passing years still labeled "the humanities." These are indeed the ministers of culture. But they are not its substance. That is something far broader and more vital. The cultured man is he who rightly understands and appreciates *life*. And that involves a like understanding and appreciation of *man*. Professor James, you remember, once said that the aim of a college course is to become able "to know a good man when you see one." I have heard the cultured man characterized as "one able to appreciate the next man's job as well as his own." Catchphrases these, of course, and not to be too closely scrutinized; yet

in intent they are true. We have come to think of culture in terms of insight and sympathy, rather than of knowledge merely or good form. With this has come a breaking-down of the old fixed distinction between the so-called "cultural" and "vocational" subjects of the curriculum.

2. We have come to see that the ends neither of culture nor of discipline of mind can be attained by a college course that embraces a little of everything but not very much of anything. We have not time to discuss the history of the principle of election as applied to the college curriculum, nor the reasons that underlay the passage from rigid prescription to free election and from free election to a group system. They are rooted mainly in the wonderful increase in knowledge which has taken place in our time. It is enough to note simply that practically all colleges now require that the student choose a major subject. To that extent they recognize the principle of specialization, not as opposed to the principles of culture and discipline, but as their very means. For one cannot truly appreciate the next man's job unless he has some knowledge of what a good job is; and he cannot comprehend the bearing upon life of many things, unless he knows some one thing well.

3. We have gotten away from the idea that the unuseableness of a given study material is in any sense a positive index of its culture or discipline value. Modern psychology has shown that interest and effort go together, that use and discipline are not incompatible. The relatively "practical" courses have come to occupy a large place, both in the college's program and in the students' choices. First came the natural sciences, then the economic and social sciences, then courses in the theory and practice of education, now applied sciences and even domestic science and household economics and art,—all rightly to be included in the curriculum provided they deal with principles and are not mere practice in technique or the imparting of rule-of-thumb methods of procedure.

We inquire then what place a college with aims such as these should give to courses in Biblical Literature, Religious Education and Religion respectively. But first we must define these terms. Under Biblical Literature may be included both courses about the Bible and courses that deal with its content as material either for historical or literary study. The term, Religious Education, is at present used in a variety of meanings, as Professor Athearn showed us in his paper on "The Training and Supply of Professional Workers in Religious Education in American Colleges." He reported one college president as writing him: "Our whole college enterprise

is conceived of as an effort in religious education." I shall use the term, as Professor Athearn does, to cover only courses that seek to train students to teach religion to others—courses, in other words, that in the religious field parallel those in the theory and practice of teaching now offered by departments of education in most colleges. The third group—courses in Religion—is more vague. It may properly include (1) courses about Religion, such as History of Religion, Science of Religion, Comparative Religion, Psychology of Religion, Philosophy of Religion, Church History; (2) courses in Applied Religion, such as Christian Ethics, Applied Christianity, Missions, the Church and Social Problems.

All of these groups of courses, I believe, may possess both cultural and utilitarian value, though obviously in varying proportion. All may and should be so organized and taught as to afford real mental discipline as well.

From both the cultural and the utilitarian points of view, courses in Biblical Literature may possess a high degree of value. I feel that every college student should do some work in this department—say at least six semester hours out of the 120 required for graduation. My conviction is based mainly upon three considerations: (1) the fundamental relation of the Bible to the Christian religion; (2) the new light that historical and critical study has cast upon the Bible in our time; (3) the plain obligation that rests upon us to do all that we can to help the student's religious development keep pace with his development in other aspects of life and culture. The period of college life is naturally one of creed-making. Instinct and environmental influence, widening knowledge and deepening purpose, alike impel to a formulation of convictions and beliefs. That student is unfortunate indeed who can bring to bear upon his creed no better conception of the Bible and no deeper understanding of its teachings than he was able to get as a child. No matter how well he may have mastered what was taught him in Sunday school, he ought to face the Bible again, bringing to it the powers, the point of view, and the apperceiving ideas that he now possesses. So only can his religion fit the rest of him. So only can he come rightly to understand life, and fully fit himself for leadership in its more important enterprises.

The value of courses in Religious Education is primarily utilitarian. There is no more significant movement of to-day than that which is transforming our Sunday schools. I believe that every college graduate should go forth prepared to enter intelligently and sympathetically into the educational work of the church with which

he identifies himself. To that end he should take at least one course in this field—say three or four hours in the principles and methods or the materials and agencies of Religious Education.

The courses in the Religion group are more heterogeneous, and of all sorts and degrees of value. They broaden experience and widen sympathy; they help in one's creed-making; they serve to co-ordinate religion with other intellectual interests and with life itself. I should like every student to take at least one course in some aspect of modern applied Christianity—say three hours on Missions, or on the Church and Social Problems.

Even in this rough statement of the fundamental value of these groups of courses, there has been indicated something of their relative importance. We may answer our question most definitely, however, if we break it up into four:

1. *How many hours may we reasonably expect each student to elect from these groups of courses as a whole?* Note clearly two things about this question: First, that it concerns each student. We are not asking how many hours a student should take who majors in one of these fields—that would of course be a higher number. Second, that the question reads *elect*. Strongly as I feel that every student ought to take some of these courses, I am opposed to requiring any of them. I believe that such a policy would retard, rather than help, the development of the right sort of departments of Biblical Literature and Religious Education. A requirement is a special privilege that too readily becomes an easy chair. These departments are too new and the courses not yet well enough standardized, to compel students to come in. For the good of the subject, we need for some years yet to be obliged to win our way. I hope you will not misunderstand me. I speak, not in criticism, but by way of encouragement. The Department of Biblical Literature needs no crutch. It can justify itself in the eyes, both of students and faculty. It can succeed, in a field free and without favor, in getting its fair share of elections and in winning respect for its standards of scholarship. The same is true of the Department of Religious Education. I know departments that have done it.

The question being thus understood, I answer: We may reasonably expect each student to elect from nine to fifteen hours out of the one hundred and twenty required for graduation. I should hardly want my boy, if he majored in some other department, to elect more than one-eighth of his college work in the general field of religion.

2. *In which of the three groups of courses should the average*

student, not majoring in this field, elect the largest number of hours? In Biblical Literature, because of the intimate relation that the Bible sustains to the content of Christian faith. Without that content, it avails little to study how to teach or apply it, or to psychologize and philosophize about it. This question again, be it remembered, is about every student.

3. *Which of the three groups of courses should the college organize into a separate department, offering major work?* Biblical Literature certainly should be so provided for; and Religious Education by many colleges. I feel constrained, however, again to refer to Professor Athearn's admirable paper and to emphasize his caution that the colleges should proceed slowly in the development of departments of Religious Education, that this development may be substantial. He urges this because of the newness of the subject, the scarcity of trained men, the lack of standardization in courses, and the need of careful experiment and interpretation. Many colleges will find it best for the present to combine the work in this field with that in Biblical Literature, and to make possible a major in Biblical Literature and Religious Education.

I question whether Religion should be organized as a separate department at all. I believe that in general this group of courses may be most effectively taught by leaving each in its place in some other department. In my own college, for example, the Department of Philosophy has long offered courses in Psychology of Religion, Philosophy of Religion, and Philosophy of Christianity—not all, of course, in the same year; the Department of History offers a course on the Reformation; the Department of Sociology one on the Church and Social Problems; while courses on History of Religion, Comparative Religion, Missions, and the Expansion of Christianity are included with Biblical Literature and Religious Education in one comprehensive department. A division has been suggested; but it is uncertain whether or not it will be accomplished. In case it should, two departments only would be formed—one for Biblical Literature, and one entitled Religious Education, which would include courses belonging to both the second and third groups dealt with in this paper.

One may add that it is really quite impossible sharply to define the third group. Courses in many departments may rightly be deemed "in Religion." Courses in biology, for example, in psychology, in anthropology, or in English, as well as in philosophy, if taught by the right man, may be of profound religious value—and that without deviating from their own proper field.

4. *In what order should the college of limited means undertake these courses?* Biblical Literature first, unquestionably. I hesitate to distinguish between the other two groups. Yet I have so deep a sense of the importance of the present movement toward the adoption by the church of a definite and responsible program of religious education, and of the service that college men and women can render in connection with that program, that I am constrained to put courses in Religious Education second. One is the more ready to do this just because Religion can be so well handled in a more or less indirect way, while Religious Education can not.

THE COLLEGE COURSE AND BIBLICAL WORK

IN WHAT YEAR OR YEARS OF THE COLLEGE COURSE SHOULD STUDENTS BE URGED TO TAKE BIBLICAL WORK

REV. ALFRED E. ALTON, B.D.

Professor of Biblical History and Literature, Colgate University

There is a wide diversity of purpose in the work of the Biblical departments of the colleges. Some departments restrict themselves, or are restricted, to the aim of giving the students a familiarity with the Bible simply as the history and literature of a people. It is studied as one of the world's great literatures. A place in the curriculum is made for it upon the same claims for cultural value that maintain other literatures in the curriculum. The presence of these departments in the colleges is a partial answer to the question Colonel C. W. Larned, Professor at West Point, is quoted in the January *Atlantic Monthly* as asking: "Why is it that, entirely aside from its religious bearings, this book is not found worthy as literature, as history, as philosophy, of a place among those fundamental elements of knowledge which are compulsory in all institutions of learning?"

That the Bible once held a place of central importance in the college curriculum, that it lost its place because the development in educational standards and methods made impossible a continuance of the unscientific methods and dogmatic utterances connected with Bible study, and that only now is the Bible regaining a foothold in the curriculum again,—all this the heads of these departments know, and their knowledge is guiding them in their present purpose as Bible teachers.

Moreover, it is urged by some teachers with whom I have corresponded that the somewhat strained relations existing between Protestants and Roman Catholics in certain sections of the country at the present time, revealed by the appearance of magazine articles like "The Anti-Papal Crusade," and by arguments arising over movements such as the attempt to compel Bible reading in New York state public schools, make unwise any departure from the consideration of the strictly literary and historical values of the Bible in classes of college students made up of Jews, Roman Catholics, and Protestants.

Where the Bible is thus taught with the purpose of leading the student into a knowledge of the events related in the Bible and into an appreciation of the Biblical language as English literature, which year of the four in the college course is chosen seems to be of no great importance. In all probability, those in charge of the arrangement of the curriculum would make no place for such courses in freshman year, for that year is carefully guarded for required work regarded as foundational to courses taken in the second year; and the study of the Bible simply as literature and history could hardly be urged as a foundational course. Perhaps the only determining factor for placing Bible study thus conducted would be the help it might give a student in connection with his study of other literatures and histories.

In many colleges, however, the way is open for Bible courses with purposes such as those noted above and also for teaching which is frankly religious. In these colleges the department of Bible is likely to be looked upon as the agency which, above all others, is counted upon for the advancement of moral and religious instruction in student life. The Bible is studied as literature and history, but the ultimate purpose of the courses is to develop the moral and religious teachings which are common to all creeds. There are colleges where this purpose if followed without offense to the mixed membership of the classes and without reversion to that reprehensible type of work which cost the Bible the place it held in the curriculum of former days. In the colleges where the Bible study is conducted with this aim, the consensus of opinion is that the work is of greatest value if given in freshman year.

1. Coming early in his college career, the course will endow the student with an enlightened knowledge of the Bible which will prevent shipwreck of his religious faith when he passes later into courses of study in Philosophy, Geology, etc.

2. Because in this period the character of the college student

is in the most formative state. The influences to which he yields himself in the first few months of his first year in college are likely to be determining influences. If in his first year at college he may have the Bible taught so that he may perceive that the religious life the Bible offers is not only compatible with college activities but that it is college life at its best, he may be helped into a college course that will result in sound character as well as sound scholarship.

Among the letters received from those offering required work with this purpose is one from Prof. W. J. Hutchins, of Oberlin College, who says: "My own judgment is that the Bible should be a required study in the freshman year. The students of an undenominational college come from every kind of home and every kind of religious or non-religious instruction. In our freshman class we have two Jews, several men who have been brought up as Catholics, the representatives of perhaps fifteen Protestant denominations. These students in such colleges are cut loose from their old moorings. By contact with upper classmen, who are absorbing the scientific view of the world, by their own introduction to this point of view in various classrooms, the freshmen are likely to be profoundly affected in religious and ethical life. Those who have been brought up in conservative homes will feel that their parents are old fogies. Those who have been brought up in irreligious homes will imagine that scholarship is on the side of secularism. Frequently the Sunday schools even of the college town are painfully inadequate to help the freshman in his need."

The college then is under moral obligation to catch the student young, under moral obligation to give him (and compel him to take!) a careful constructive course of Bible study.

As to the course of study for the year, the weight of opinion is that it should be historical, and planned to develop the principal religious teachings of the Bible as a whole. To be of value it should have three hours a week. A difficulty appears in the arrangement of such a course which is beginning to make itself felt in all curriculum Bible courses. Students are entering college from preparatory schools now giving better courses of Bible study than are offered in some colleges. There are found in the colleges, also, graduates of high schools who had been students in graded Sunday schools where a high order of elementary Bible study has been followed. Over against the pitiful ignorance of the Bible which has amused so many college investigators in the past, there may be found now in an increasing degree a well-founded elementary knowledge of

the Bible which is the result of careful study under trained teachers. As the graded Sunday schools increase in efficiency and the preparatory schools continue their high standard Bible study, how will it be possible to arrange required courses which will meet the needs of these students and also of the entering classmen who come with no knowledge of the Bible?

If required work could be offered in another year besides the freshman year, the senior year seems to be the most acceptable time. Facing the time when he is about to assume full responsibilities of citizenship and parenthood, in a year when so many college students yield themselves with fine abandon to a sincere idealism, members of the senior class are more apt to welcome courses of Bible study pointing the way to deeper knowledge of religious teachings than are juniors or sophomores. Along with the required work, elective courses could be maintained for those desiring them from any of the classes.

If we could all have our way as teachers of the Bible, and could be certain that our way would work well, we would probably vote to have Bible study required in at least two years of the college course, so highly do we rate the value of our Bible courses, which are passed by unnoticed by many college boys who need them. Denied that, we would choose the freshman year for required work, with electives open to students in other classes. Failing in having any of our work listed as required, which is the lot of most of us, we can content ourselves in keeping our elective courses pedagogically sound in content and arrangement, and at the same time strive to make them attractive and helpful to the ever-increasing number of students who choose them.

THE CONTENT OF AN IDEAL CURRICULUM OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGES

HENRY THATCHER FOWLER, PH.D.

Professor of Biblical Literature and History, Brown University

My theme is not of my own formulation; if it were, I should seem to myself presumptuous, for ideals are and of right ought to be big and elusive things. In seeking to unfold their nature, Baldwin in his "Psychology," says they are "the forms which we feel our conceptions would take, if we were able to realize in them a satisfying degree of unity, harmony, significance, and universality." Some of us would hesitate to meet a definition like that on a lonely road. I certainly cannot assume to formulate, even on paper, a course of study which shall realize a satisfying degree of unity, harmony, significance, and universality. I hope, however, that such criteria may lie in the background as normative factors, helping to shape the suggestions I may offer toward a college curriculum of religious instruction.

In considering the subject of religious instruction in a liberal undergraduate course, I would emphasize at the outset the conviction that (1) there is no absolute line of demarcation between the religious and other studies of the curriculum; and (2) that studies which are more distinctly religious should be treated as a normal and integral part of the entire college curriculum.

I have sometimes read to classes in the Old Testament this description: "The literature of this country has for its chief mark a religious sense of duty. It represents a people striving through successive generations to find out the right and do it, to root out the wrong, and labor ever onward for the love of God." To my question, "Of what people is the writer speaking?" the answer always comes instantly, "Israel"; but the passage continues: "If this be really the strong spirit of her people, to show that it is so is to tell how England won, etc.," for the quotation comes from Henry Morley's great work on "English Writers." My colleague of the Romance Language Department tells his students that "it is no accident that Dante is religious poetry, for," he adds, "all the great world poems are religious." In a company of clergymen, I have heard the feeling fervently expressed and unanimously accepted that such a teacher as this one is needed in a theological seminary to give the students an insight into the spiritual interpretation of literature as he is giving it each year to large and enthu-

siastic classes of undergraduates in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures.

Surely for the apprehension of deep and far-reaching religious truths, the literature of England or Italy may afford most appropriate material of instruction. The general history of art, too, is no less germane. Who can thoroughly know the meaning and message of Christianity without some intelligent appreciation of Christian art, both painting and architecture? Such knowledge is a most potent balance against certain superficial and one-sided tendencies in present-day religion. And so I might go on through many departments of college study. The relation of sociology to practical religion is widely recognized; a department of biology may be one of the strongest moral forces in the college and have no small share in shaping the religious thinking of the students. Certainly all the humanities, in the broadest sense of the term, have their part in an ideal curriculum of religious instruction. I have the impression that those colleges which have most sharply marked off religious studies from the rest of the curriculum have not thereby rendered the greatest service to religion.

Recognizing all this, we are not denying that some subjects are more distinctly religious than others, nor that religion is such an important aspect of all life that it should have separate recognition in a liberal course of study. Biblical Literature is properly a more distinctively religious study than English Literature, and the Philosophy of Religion more than the general History of Philosophy. Whether the special studies should be prescribed or elective, must depend, I think, upon the general character and practices of the particular institution.

This brings me to my second point, that the curriculum of distinctively religious instruction should not be considered in isolation, for these studies, if they belong in the regular college course at all, belong there as a normal and integral part of a unified and harmonious whole. If, for example, the institution has the group system, with all subjects arranged in three or four great classes, the religious studies should be classified in these groups and not listed apart. Biblical Literature and History, Church History, History of Religion, Philosophy of Religion—each belongs rationally in some one of the great groups.

While we are considering religious studies as a part of a harmonious whole, we may emphasize in passing the point, with specific reference to Biblical study, that the instruction should be of the full grade and character that the college offers in other departments;

the teachers in this field no less trained specialists than those in other departments, and the quality of work no less rigid. Here lies one of the great dangers when religious subjects are too sharply separated from the rest of the course. Instruction in different colleges of good standing differs greatly in its nature; it is sometimes still, I fear, dogmatic. This method is described concretely as "using one textbook and trotting along obediently in the footsteps of the author." The instruction in other colleges has reached the stage of free comparison of authorities; in some, it is calculated from the start to introduce students progressively to methods of genuine investigation. I have a strong feeling that there is danger in introducing students to critical study through religious subjects, and that our work must therefore be limited by the character of the college in which we teach. On the other hand, I am sure that it is dangerous to give college courses in religion which are characterized by less of freedom in investigation than the institution affords in the study of other fields of history, literature, and philosophy. Have I been discussing method rather than content? I do not see how we can select and arrange our subjects of religious instruction intelligently, unless we keep such principles distinctly in mind.

It is, however, high time to take up the question of what subjects we shall include in our curriculum and how arrange them. For practical purposes, I would make a three-fold classification of the material from which we may select:

- (1) Religion—its philosophy, psychology, history.
- (2) Biblical Religion—its history, literature, content.
- (3) Practical Religion—its organization and conduct.

From these groups, the elements of our ideal curriculum are to be selected.

The very practical question meets us at the outset: How large a share of the entire four years' liberal course may we reasonably appropriate, on paper, at least? As an ideal that is not wholly beyond the possibility of attainment, I would suggest, one course of two to three hours per week throughout the four years—a total of eight semester courses. Of this time, I would devote one year to studies from the first group—Religion in general, and, at any rate for some students, one or two semesters to the third group—Practical Religion. This would leave for all, two to three years for Biblical Religion, including the history of Christianity beyond its first century.

To enumerate more in detail: of the two semesters given to the

general aspects of religion, one semester is adequate for an outline study of the history of the world's great religions, and the other can be devoted either to the philosophy or psychology of the subject. I am of the opinion that most students who have had work in general psychology can get all the psychology of religion that they need in a semester's course on the philosophy of religion. Others may prefer to give the half year to the psychology.

In reference to the third group, we must recognize that it is distinctly contrary to the policy of some excellent colleges to include any practical courses in a liberal curriculum. I would myself offer opportunity for those students who desire to take one or two semester courses in Sunday school organization and instruction; the materials, history, principles of religious education; the history and principles of missions—some work of that nature, if possible, several alternative courses, to meet the needs and interests of different students. Courses which aim at definite formulation of the content of Christian thought and living, Christian ethics or the essentials of Christian religion, may be classified under the head of Practical Religion and offered as alternatives of the courses that deal with specific phases of modern Christian service.

If a student devotes a full year each to the work of groups 1 and 3, I think he cannot afford more than one semester for the post-Biblical Church History. If practical religion is given only one semester, or is omitted altogether, then a full year may well be devoted to the history of the Christian Church from the post-Apostolic age onward. Thus we secure three or four semesters for Biblical History and Literature. The work in this field may be variously arranged but it should aim to assure some appreciation of the literary form and the history of the Biblical writings, as well as their moral and religious content and significance. If only one year of Biblical work is possible, I would prefer a complete chronological study of Biblical Literature. This can be made to include, in a general way, all the essentials just indicated: an appreciation of the form and growth of the Biblical Literature and the moral and religious content and significance. Such a course affords a broad and normative preparation for lifelong study and application of Biblical truth.

Allowing one and a half or two years to the Bible, I would give half of the time to the Old and New Testament History. The work may be in the general history of ancient Israel and of the founding and early spread of Christianity viewed as a part of world history, or, it may be predominantly biographical, taking

up great constructive leaders and their work; it may be distinctively the history of Biblical Religion, the origin and growth of the Hebrew Religion and of early Christianity. These are suggestions merely of the varied possibilities for an historical course. The history and literature may be taken up together in a two-year course covering the Old and New Testaments, or one year may be given to history and one to literature.

Such would be my present ideal for the general content of a college course in religious instruction—one year devoted to the study of Religion as a part of all human experience; one or two semesters, at least for some students, to the proper organization and conduct of some great phase of modern religious service or to the definite formulation of the essentials of Christian thought and conduct; one or two semesters to Church History; one or two years to Biblical Literature and History.

When we try to arrange this work in its proper order to fit into the college curriculum, we may find perplexing problems. Clearly the Philosophy and Psychology of Religion cannot come before general Philosophy and Psychology, and must therefore be put in the latter part of the course. The practical course too, if taken at all, comes naturally near the end of the four years. The difficulty is to find what we can put early. A thorough study of the life of Christ or of Hebrew History means a type of work that presupposes college training in other fields of history. I feel that a general course in Biblical Literature, such as I have suggested, can be given to sophomores fairly successfully. I believe too that a course in the history of Biblical Religion can be made intelligible and profitable for second-year men. In one way or another all the work in Biblical Literature and History may be arranged for sophomore and junior years, but what can come in the freshman year? It has been suggested that if a year's work in the Bible is required, it should be put in the sophomore year. I assume in that case, that there would be no Biblical work in the freshman year, and I am myself very dubious about placing any there, either required or elective; this for two reasons: (1) The students who enter from some private schools and academies have given much time to Biblical study of a pretty good secondary school type. The same ought to be increasingly true of those who have attended graded Sunday schools. The work in college must be from the start of such a nature that it will not even seem to those students a repetition of what they have already had. That conviction comes to me strongly, not from theory, but from student testimony.

The work must seem to offer, by the very name and subject of the course, a new outlook. One of the greatest causes of intellectual apathy in college, I believe, is the fact that the eager anticipation of a new kind of work is often disappointed in the freshman year. I should feel grave danger in giving freshmen the new kind of Biblical work to which we must introduce them later on, because they are not prepared for it by their other college study.

I have not had opportunity to experiment much, for my department offers no courses regularly open to freshmen; I have been wondering, however, whether in some institutions a general course in the History of Religion might not be placed in the first semester of the college work. Such a course would need to be made objective and it would then give a broad background for later study of Biblical Literature and Religion. It would, too, fit in well with the classical study of some of the students. I wonder again whether this could not be followed in the second semester by an outline study of the History of Christianity, so that the first year's work would give a general survey of the world's great religions. Such a survey course, it seems to me, would very logically prepare the way for the more detailed study of the literature and history of the Bible and for the consideration of the nature and validity of religion in human experience, to be taken up later from the philosophical point of view, and also for the study of the practical application of Christianity in education, missions, and morals.

If such a course in the History of Religion be not practicable for the freshman year, a course in the ancient civilization of the nearer East which would properly include something of religions and would place Israel and the rise of Christianity in their world setting, would afford a most helpful background for the later courses of more distinctly religious instruction. After a semester's work in Old Testament history, I asked a fine group made up of juniors, seniors, and graduates for their opinion as to the desirability and practicability of such a course in Oriental history. They handed me some pointed and thoughtful statements, and I was surprised at their unanimity in favor of the suggested course. I think that this could be given in a way that would seem to the freshman a great advance upon all his previous work and yet would be intelligible and not open to the dangers inherent in introducing critical study of the Bible in the first year. Uncritical study of the Bible will seem to the new student mere Sunday school or preparatory school work, and he is not yet ready for its critical study.

If my conclusions are correct, our tentative ideal curriculum of religious instruction will be arranged somewhat as follows:

1st year:—History of Religions or Ancient History of the Near East, followed in the second semester by the History of Christianity.

2d and 3d years:—Biblical History and Literature.

4th year:—Philosophy of Religion and Practical Religion.

Fully equipped colleges ought also to offer Biblical courses in the original languages, as supplementary or alternative to courses in English. To me it seems most unfortunate that Christian students who have studied Greek from three to five years should graduate from college without one semester's course in the Greek Testament, to learn how easily they can read much of it and with what a new sense of power and mastery they can use the sacred literature. Hebrew seems destined to be the possession of the few, and its discussion belongs largely to professional work.

We have been considering the study of Religion from philosophical, historical, literary, and practical angles of vision, as a significant and appropriate part of a course of liberal study. We have not touched upon that which is so emphasized by the student of Religious Pedagogy—the need of expressional activity. How far and how closely this may eventually be associated with the curriculum study, I am not prepared to suggest. For professional training, I have begun a little formal experimenting. I am quite sure that most teachers of the more distinctively religious subjects are co-operating with the students in active religious service, or at least keeping in touch with this side of their lives. A body of experience is thus being acquired which might well be brought together at some future gathering.

THE CONTENT OF AN IDEAL CURRICULUM OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN COLLEGES

ISMAR J. PERITZ, PH.D.

Professor of Biblical Languages and Literature, Syracuse University, New York

Our ideal is limited by the fact that the curriculum contemplated is to be but a part of the regular college course leading to the A.B. degree. The courses that go into that curriculum must commend themselves as possessing general educational and culture values as distinguished from mere professional values. Full training for most competent leadership in religious work must be sought in the graduate school of religion, the theological seminary, or the religious training school. It is from these institutions that we shall expect to come the fully trained ministers, directors of religious education, missionaries, or Christian Association secretaries.

But the college curriculum may be so adjusted as to furnish a correlated group of courses which in their combined form would constitute a curriculum of religious education in the broader sense. It should be comprehensive enough to prepare for efficient service that large class of men and women who give their services voluntarily in religious work, and be the basis for advanced studies for those who seek more professional training.

The content of an ideal curriculum as thus contemplated may be grouped as follows:

Group I. RELIGION.		
1. Psychology	3	hours
2. Ethics	3	"
3. The History of Religion	3	"
4. The Philosophy of Religion	3	"
Group II. BIBLICAL RELIGION.		
1. Biblical History	3	"
2. Biblical Literature	3	"
3. Biblical Religion	3	"
4. Biblical Languages	6	"
Group III. CHRISTIAN RELIGION.		
1. History of Christianity	3	"
2. The Social Problems of Christianity	3	"
3. The Propagation of Christianity	3	"
Group IV. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.		
1. History of Education	3	"
2. Methods and Practice Work	3	"
Total	42	hours

Group I has for its subject the nature of Religion. The course in psychology will acquaint the student with those fundamental

and general processes, laws, and conditions of the mental life of which the religious element forms a part. The course in ethics will give him the means by which to evaluate which religion has the most moral values. The History of Religion will bring him face to face with the varied manifestations of the religious spirit in the world and lead him to determine their comparative merits. The study of the Philosophy of Religion will furnish him with the grounds of belief in God and the moral order in the universe. From the pursuit of these studies the student should carry the intelligent conviction that Religion is a normal and essential element in human life and that to be engaged in its dissemination is to contribute to the highest welfare of the human race.

Group II has for its subject the Bible and the origin and growth of the Hebrew religion culminating in the Christian religion. The course in Biblical History should furnish a comprehensive survey of the outstanding events, personalities, and institutions of Biblical times, with special reference to their permanent value to civilization. The course in Biblical Literature should not only deal with each part as a unit, with view to its historical origin, literary character, and religious and moral teachings, but also from the point of view of its place in the chronological order to which it belongs. The origin of the Bible as a whole or a collection and as an English version should also receive due attention. The greatest importance should be attached to a course in the teachings of the Bible. This course should trace the essential religious, ethical, and social ideas of the Bible through their various stages of growth to their culmination in New Testament teachings.

There is still a failure fully to appreciate the strictly practical value of critical and historical Bible study, even among its friends. In religious leadership the Bible will ever have to be the great textbook. In view of the great variety of religious and ethical ideals that the Bible contains, a critical knowledge of its content is absolutely essential to its proper use for religious education. Biblical criticism, not as an end in itself, but as a means to the end of giving access to the right material for clear-cut religious and ethical ideas, should not be lightly treated.

The study of the original Biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek, are now quite commonly regarded as practically useless. But there is an aspect of the question that may well be considered. The college curriculum demands a certain amount of language study, ancient or modern languages, or both. I have known a number of instances where college students have elected a course in Spanish,

for instance, for which they admittedly had no particular use, except to fulfill the requirements of the college curriculum. We have made it a rule that in the case of a student preparing for religious work the substitution of Hebrew is permissible to cover the language requirement. A course of Hebrew will give the student the pedagogical values of a language study and also open up his closer approach to the main source of information in his career. If I could reach the preparatory schools, I should suggest to those students who are looking toward religious work as their profession that, if they are bound to choose but one ancient language, it be Greek instead of Latin, for it would give them all the pedagogic values of the study of an ancient language and at the same time open up to them a deeper interest in the New Testament. But as long as the study of languages is an educational requirement, so long may the original languages of the Bible lay claim to attention of those to whom the Bible will be the main textbook in their work.

Group III has for its subject the propagation of the Christian religion and its influence upon the civilization of the present time. The course in the History of Christianity should acquaint the student with the various forms Christianity has assumed from its rise to the present time. But its main purpose should be to bring him into sympathetic touch with the religious forces of to-day, rather than to enlighten him on the dogmatic differences. His course in sociology should make him see how to apply the principles of Christianity to the economic and sociological problems of modern life and the part that the various institutions and organizations for social betterment should take in the task. A course in the principles and history of home and foreign mission work should be made to possess strictly educational and cultural values in broadening the student's horizon and in making him realize the forces at work in modern times tending to world-wide civilization.

Group IV has for its subject the principles of education in their application to Religious Education. As the teacher of religion has to perform exactly the same functions in his sphere that other teachers do, he needs to know the principles of education. which a general course in the History of Education will give him. A laboratory course in method and practice work is the best practical accompaniment to a course in theory, and is as important in the preparation for efficiency in the church school as in any other.

The total time required for these courses is forty-two year hours out of sixty, in other words, about two thirds of the college

course, leaving one third for other studies. This distribution compares favorably with the specialization contemplated in colleges where the major and minor system is in vogue. These studies would balance a student's college course as well as the elective courses of those who are preparing themselves for teaching other branches.

But while this curriculum is designed for the undergraduate college course, it might easily yield itself to expansion into a graduate course.

THE FARGO COLLEGE PLAN FOR A DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

WALLACE N. STEARNS, PH.D.

Professor of Biblical History and Religious Education, Fargo College, North Dakota

For one of two reasons the American college until recent years avoided the issue of Religious Education: (1) the desire to imitate and so line up with the universities; (2) the fear of being classed with the theological seminaries. Pressed by other demands, college presidents assumed that the problem was being cared for elsewhere. College professors looked upon the entire matter as out of the range of the busy scientific man. When courses in English Bible were introduced the gap was regarded as filled. All talk of the application of pedagogy to religious education and the organization of forces for systematic moral and religious training, was cavalierly passed over to some recondite corner of the university or divinity school, there, quite likely, to be suitably shelved. Once upon a time, before education became a livable pursuit, the entire matter was passed over to the clergy, who, it was argued, had vowed themselves to poverty and sacrifice. From that error we are slowly emerging. Similarly religious education was laid on the shoulders of the clergy, who, often with more zeal than skill, accepted the responsibility. The advent of the layman was hailed with as much surprise as was Saul among the Prophets. To-day the layman acknowledges his responsibility and his need for special training.

This much gained, further procrastination was excused on the ground of scarcity of funds and more pressing needs. In the beginning, then, demands must be reduced to a minimum. Now peda-

gogy is pedagogy, and Baptist pedagogy is the same as Methodist pedagogy, and all efficient pedagogy rests on the same fundamental principles. This being the case, courses already offered by the college can be utilized in meeting the new need. That is, a circular for religious education can with a few additions be made up from the college catalog. The present resources of the college are thus so grouped as to serve a new constituency. This will afford the minimum provision, but it is better than inactivity.

The work of such a department divides naturally into three groups.*

I. SUBJECT-MATTER TO BE TAUGHT.

This includes courses in the English Bible, Old Testament History, Church History, History of English Bible; elementary Hebrew and Greek; Religious Art and Music; supplementary courses in English and such other languages as may be needed in the several communities; Philosophy, Ethics, Sociology; Christian Missions, modern religious movements, and modern religious institutions as Sunday school, Christian Association, and the like.†

II. EFFICIENT METHODS OF TEACHING.

The application of the principles of education to moral and religious training.

III. PRACTICAL TEACHING AND TRAINING IN METHODS.

1. Practice in actual classroom teaching. In order to give pupils skill in actual teaching they are placed in charge of classes in the various departments of the city Sunday schools under capable supervision. Teaching plans are approved and helpful criticism is given. Two of the Fargo Sunday schools have been so correlated with the college department that a credit of one unit on the certificate (but not on the college diploma) is granted for a year's work in the Sunday school teacher-training departments.

2. A study of City Institute problems. Students who are preparing to conduct city institutes are given a lecture each week on the problems of organization and management of city teacher-training institutes. Some observation work will be afforded under capable supervision.

*This is practically the work offered by Fargo College.

†North Dakota is a rural state. Most of its towns are small villages and must be largely self-supporting, socially and intellectually. What is needed in each community is educated men and women, who in addition to their vocation are able by ability and training to organize local talent and energies. Especially is there need of musical leaders for chorus and orchestral work and a need of volunteer secretaries to lay the foundations for future Association work. And there is urgent need for leaders in scientific Sunday school organization.

3. Preliminary training in Christian Association work.

No two colleges serve quite the same constituency or face the same conditions. Hence close standardization for the present seems impracticable.

The purpose and method of the Fargo plan is thus set forth in the bulletin; It is not the purpose of the college to start a theological seminary, but in response to a widely felt need and demand, to provide courses in religious and moral education. Four classes of students are especially provided for: (1) the lay worker seeking increased efficiency; (2) the student preparing for professional studies in seminary, association, settlement, or other training school; (3) the worker desiring supplemental training or seeking up-to-date methods; and (4) all wishing to participate more intelligently in the moral and religious activities of home, church, and community.

The regular course leading to full certificate involves sixty-four hours of credit work, of which thirty-two hours must be selected from Group I. The balance may be made up in Group II.

GROUP I

On completion of thirty-two hours of the work listed under this department, a certificate in Religious Education will be granted. A maximum credit of twenty hours will be granted students of other standard colleges, the balance to be made up—avoiding duplications—from the work listed under Section I.

1. Biblical History and Literature, 11 hours.
2. Psychology, Philosophy, and Pedagogy of Religion, 11 hours.
3. Sociology.
4. Rhetoric and Oratory.
5. Religion, Art, and Music. From Sections 3, 4, 5,— 10 hours.

GROUP II

Selected courses from the several college departments.

SHORT COURSES

To accommodate those who may not be able to attend an entire semester, the work of many of the courses offered is so arranged as to permit any desiring, to take the first or second half of a semester, credit for the amount of work done being given on the certificate in Religious Education.

LECTURE COURSES

In 1912-13 the following courses were given:

1. Israel and the Nations. The land of Israel and adjacent countries in the light of recent discoveries. Stereopticon. Five lectures.

2. Introduction to Religious Education. These lectures define the several fields of study and acquaint the student with the best books, equipment, and the means for procuring the same.

3. The World of Paul. In 1913-15 a series of lectures were given on the manuscripts of the Bible.

CAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BECOME SCIENTIFIC?

BENJAMIN S. WINCHESTER, D.D.

Editor and Educational Secretary, Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society

Religious Education, and in fact all education, began in a more or less informal way. As civilization has progressed education has become more extensive, complex, and systematic. Its formal processes have been acquired through intuition and experience and have been handed on by tradition. The question is here raised as to whether education, and Religious Education in particular, can become scientific. In other words, are the results to be secured through Religious Education so intangible that the processes by which they are to be attained must forever remain instinctive and traditional or at least based upon opinion.

Every attempt to standardize educational processes and thereby to increase efficiency, involves the attempt to state in clear terms the objective aimed at and to measure the progress toward the desired end. Indeed, as Strayer observes, "Efficiency in any line of human endeavor depends upon our ability to evaluate the results which are secured," and progress in the religious as well as in the other phases of education must come through a careful study of the facts. Such study has been going on for some time in the field of general education. Within the last twenty years various cities have conducted educational surveys and at least three states have made state-wide educational investigations.

The attempts at measurement have, thus far, been confined for

the most part to such subjects as Penmanship, Spelling, and Arithmetic, which, by their very nature, lend themselves readily to quantitative tests. By applying the tests, in Arithmetic for example, it is possible to reveal to the teacher just the degree of the pupil's attainment and also the relative rapidity with which different members of a grade advance. It is also possible to establish objective standards in specific operations, by using these tests throughout a school system. At the same time, the application of the tests reveals to the child his ability and furnishes an incentive to correct his own faults.

It is obviously impossible as yet to provide for Religious Education any such objective standards and units of measurement as have been suggested for Arithmetic. Indeed, such standards are not even proposed for most other subjects taught in the day school. In the teaching of Religion, the choice of subject matter, the organization of the school, the methods of preparing and presenting the lesson, are still largely determined by tradition and suggestions for improvement are based upon opinion.

It should not be assumed, however, that teachers in the Sunday school are wholly indifferent to the question of efficiency. For some time the International Sunday School Association has laid emphasis upon the matter of standards and has formulated a so-called Standard of Excellence. The various denominations, also, have shown an increasing interest in the subject and at Dayton, Ohio, in 1913, the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations joined with the International Sunday School Association in promulgating the following "Standard of Efficiency":

1. Cradle Roll.
2. Home Department.
3. Organized Bible Classes in Secondary and Adult Divisions.
4. Teacher Training.
5. Graded organization and instruction.
6. Missionary instruction and offering.
7. Temperance instruction.
8. Definite decision for Christ urged.
9. Offering for denominational Sunday school work.
10. Workers' conference regularly held.

It was recommended that this be the minimum standard and that it should remain unchanged for a period of years. Department standards are also advocated and adult class standards.

It is evident, however, that this standard is a very different thing from the standards in arithmetic just referred to. For one

thing, the feature of a *quantitative* measurement is conspicuous by its absence. In but two instances out of the ten is there any clear suggestion of *qualitative* considerations. Most of the points included have to do with matters of organization and even so are too vaguely expressed to have real value. It can hardly be regarded as a "Standard of Efficiency" but rather as an attempt to combine several promotion programs into one general program covering the organization of the entire school.

A distinction should be made between a *standard* and a *program*. A program is local and practical; in it are stressed those things which local necessity demands. A standard is an attempt to formulate the ideal. In the standard are included those things which are indispensable if the ideal is to be realized, and the aim accomplished. The program may be regarded as suggesting the steps which must be taken to attain the standard. The best service will be rendered a school when we can say to it in clear and terse expression what it ought to aim at and what it must do if it is to accomplish its aim. It is doing no kindness to the ineffective school to modify the standard to suit its ineffectiveness. It is helpful, however, to point out to it the steps which may first be taken toward the accomplishment of its aim. But the steps will be different for different pupils and for different schools.

The first task in formulating an educational standard is to define clearly the aim. A Sunday school standard should state the aim of the Sunday school, and all specifications should be formulated in terms of this aim. We find ourselves therefore face to face with the question, What is the aim of Religious Education? What is the aim of the Sunday school?

The aim of education in general may be said to be the development of personality. The grading of pupils is an effort to bring together those individuals who are most alike in order that there may be the nearest approach to individual instruction. The grading of lesson material is an effort to bring to each one the stimulus and food which that individual most needs at the time when he most needs it. Specialization of teaching method is again an effort to develop a more intimate acquaintance of the teacher with the individual that he may suit his teaching more fully to the individual needs. Educational institutions of all kinds, including the Sunday school, are earnestly seeking the welfare of the individual (which welfare of course implies the socialization of the individual). A standard for the Sunday school, therefore, must be formulated in terms of the religious life of the individual. In a general way it

may be said that the aim is to develop to the utmost at each stage of his growth the religious life of the individual.

This again of course raises the question as to how one may judge of religious attainment. It is right here that one finds himself baffled in attempting to measure the pupil's progress. Certainly a mere record of attendance furnishes no adequate criterion; neither does the completion of a textbook even when attested by an examination, either written or oral. Yet the fact that it may be difficult to devise a method of measurement should not deter us from making the attempt and it may encourage those who are engaged in the work of Religious Education to reflect that the most thoughtful leaders in the work of general education are wrestling with the same problem.

It will be necessary first to determine upon a qualitative standard before attempt is made to provide quantitative measurement. It has been remarked by a careful student "that experienced teachers will *readily* describe their own procedure in presenting a given topic to pupils, while they will usually hesitate and show embarrassment when asked to describe the procedure to be expected from pupils in studying the same topic." In other words, teachers seem to be conscious that pupils should do something quite different from what they themselves do, but they are more or less in the dark as to what it should be. As another has put it, "The only available measure of the success of the work done in any particular school is to be found in the changes which are brought about in boys and girls, young men and young women, during the period of their school life. The changes sought for in Religious Education as in other forms of education, may take place in habit, knowledge, in methods of work, in interests and ideals, in power of appreciation." The only way in which the teacher can ascertain what changes actually do take place is through the pupils' own expression in word and deed—that is, through the pupils' conduct.

A very interesting and valuable investigation in this field was that recently made by Professor Hanus and his associates in the schools of New York City, the results of which are embodied in a volume by Prof. Frank M. McMurry, "Elementary School Standards." In that investigation an attempt was made to select a list of the main elements in daily living that might be taken as standards in judging instruction. While it was recognized that any such lists would vary according to the person who made them, it was believed that certain essentials could be found that are common to every person's welfare. Four factors were chosen because

of their universality and as being particularly worthy of acceptance as aims of school instruction and sufficient to test the general effectiveness of teaching. Although these are not selected with special reference to Religious Education, it is believed that they will be found applicable here also, and at the same time suggestive in any further research. These factors were as follows:

1. Motive on the part of the pupils. In this it is recognized that ambitions may be increased and improved along with knowledge, and that through the daily work of education a pupil is being prepared to meet the crises and tests of character in a wise way and to make choices with intelligence and confidence.

2. The weighing of values is a second significant factor. Education involves discrimination and skill in testing the relative merits of facts, ideas, and objects of varying value. Education involves a training in judgment, and in power to appreciate relative values.

3. A third factor of importance is organization of ideas. The investigator believes that scattered thinking is a frequent cause of failure. He emphasizes the necessity for *orderly* thinking such as will assure thoroughness of comprehension and consistent force in presentation. In other words, what is taught must be inwrought into the very fibre of one's being. "No subject is mastered until the relation of its parts to one another is determined, until the facts bearing upon each phase are separately grouped, and until enough such facts are collected to give fair support to each leading idea." Certainly here is an indispensable test of the effectiveness of Religious Education.

4. Power of initiative is named as the fourth factor, by which is meant "the ability to act as a leader, whether in one's own affairs or in the affairs of others." The school should cultivate in the pupil the power of self-direction and self-reliance. This has a bearing upon the curriculum, which must be intimately related to the child's experience. It also requires of the teacher a remarkable degree of self-restraint lest the pupil be prevented from sharing to the utmost the leadership of recitation or discussion.

It can hardly be doubted that these four elements are all of decided importance in Religious Education. Motive, the judgment of values, the organization of ideas, and the power of initiative are all qualities which are fundamental to an effective moral and religious character. This list is particularly distinctive in its emphasis upon the fact that instruction should be *dynamic* rather than *static*; i.e., it should aim at a result in *conduct in action* and not merely the repetition of a formula or the acquiescence in a sym-

bol. Whether this is just the list which will best set forth the aims in religious instruction or whether it needs modification to suit this special purpose, may be open to question. The list, however, should be brief, it should emphasize the dynamic aspects of teaching, and it should be applicable universally.

The means by which to attain such results as we have mentioned in the life of the individual are partly personal and partly mechanical. The development of the religious life of the individual is sought through the process of instruction, and the quality of the instruction is conditioned primarily by the clearness with which the teacher perceives the higher aims of his task, and by the intelligence and consistency with which he employs appropriate means for attaining these aims. The quality of instruction is further conditioned by the curriculum of material provided for the teacher, the nature of the organization in which he works, and the kind of supervision attempted.

The standardizing of a school, therefore, involves a *standardizing of the teaching process, the curriculum, the activities, the organization, and the supervision.*

STANDARDIZING THE TEACHING PROCESS

I. TESTS OF THE PUPIL'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL LIFE.—It may not be altogether apparent as to just how one should go to work to set standards for religious and moral education. The situation here seems to be a little different from the process of standardizing the teaching of a subject in day school. One may go into a literature class, for example, or a class in geography and apply the tests suggested by Prof. McMurry* in such a way as to ascertain whether the teaching of that particular lesson is developing a pupil's ambition and motives, increasing his power of discrimination, giving him mastery of his subject, and offering opportunity for the exercise of initiative. But religion is not a *subject* in this sense. The pupil does not take a textbook in religion like a textbook on geography, and follow it. The problem here rather seems to be to determine how the teacher may use subject material in such wise as to develop these characteristics before mentioned and at the same time strengthen religious attitudes. It would seem that there should be first some test of the pupil's religious and moral powers in terms of these four characteristics as a basis for comparison later on. I would suggest some such scheme as the following for

*Elementary School Standards.

the study of the individual. In this case let us suppose a boy ten years of age:

1 *Motive.* What are his favorite sports and occupations? How does he spend his free time?

What stories does he like best?

Who are his most intimate friends?

2 *Values.* What are his most highly prized possessions?

Is he considerate of the rights of others?

Whom does he most admire, and why?

Is he reverent towards parents, teachers, the church, the law, and toward God?

Does he use clean language?

Is he truthful?

3 *Organization of Ideas.* Is he fair in his play?

Does he play marbles "for keeps"?

Is he helpful in his home and school?

Is he thoughtful for the sick, the weak and the unfortunate?

Is he kind to his pets and other animals?

Is he faithful in pursuance of his duties?

Is he loyal to his friends?

Is he obedient?

Is he courteous toward his elders?

Is he generous?

4 *Initiative.* Is he a leader among his companions or is he himself easily led?

Is he communicative or reticent?

Does he resent injustice?

Is he investigative?

How does he behave when suddenly confronted by danger, injustice, or a suggestion for dishonest, unfair, cowardly, immodest, disobedient, or lawless conduct?

What differences are noticeable in his behavior at home or in school, as compared with that upon the playground or with other boys?

II. THE COURSE OF STUDY.—This will be governed by the following considerations:

1 *Motives.* It will contain what a boy of ten likes,—story material, in which are reflected his favorite occupations, the qualities he admires in his friends and others.

2 *Values.* It will furnish opportunity to exercise judgments as to things of most value in his own life, as to the rights of himself

and of others, as to responsibility of himself and others, as to the best ways of self-expression in language and conduct.

3 *Organization.* It will suggest ways for relating new ideas to present experience: Play, home, school, and daily conduct in various relationships. This implies an accompanying program of appropriate activities for both Sunday and week-day, closely related to the course of study on the one hand, and to the boy's daily life on the other.

4 *Initiative.* It will be so presented as to facilitate at each step in the teaching the spontaneous co-operation of the pupil through his own questions, suggestions, attitudes, or activities.

III. THE SCHOOL.—The school should be built up of units (grades or classes), each composed of pupils brought together because they are similar in their personal qualities and needs.

The school curriculum should be constructed of courses of study selected, prepared, and taught in accordance with the principles suggested above and extending over the whole period of life represented in the community.

Besides study courses the curriculum should provide a complete program of correlated activities not duplicating, but related to, all the other educational agencies of the community, formal and informal, and providing full opportunity for initiative and self-expression.

IV. ADMINISTRATION.—The administrative task prepares a close analogy to the task of the teacher, except that here the superintendent becomes the teacher and the teachers are his pupils. In planning the school policies, therefore, the superintendent needs to study the motives of his teachers and present his suggestions in such a way as to appeal to their interest. He will leave them plenty of room for exercising discrimination and forming independent judgments. He will see that new ideas and theories are not matters held merely as theories, but find their expression in the actual work of the school. He will encourage each teacher to develop originality and initiative in his teaching methods. In short, the whole teaching process from primary class to Bible class and theological seminary should be subjected to the same searching analysis and measured by the same standards.

QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT

The above considerations have significance only in determining the quality of teaching. Quantitative tests must follow. These may be arrived at by careful study of each step in the teaching process

recording the results for a given period of time and comparing these from time to time.

Some criticisms of present methods:

1 *Current "Standards" are pitifully meagre.* Schools will never be standardized by a promotion campaign with ten or any number of "Points of Excellence." Such a campaign may be valuable in creating public opinion favorable to standardization, but to bring up a school to a real standard is a slow and methodical undertaking.

2 *Courses of Study.* The best of these are now based upon the characteristics and needs of children, and are designed to appeal to their interests and enlist their co-operation. The specifications accompanying them, however, are still framed too largely in terms of what the teacher must do and not sufficiently with reference to the changes desired to take place in the child. Many of them are too much influenced by other considerations; e.g., desire to cover so much ground in a given time, desire to fit in with the church year, desire to prepare for church membership.

3 *The Teaching Process.* Too little provision is made for practice in weighing values, in forming judgments, in making choices, and in pupil initiative. Fullest suggestions are needed, at least in terms of pupil activity.

4 *Expressional Activity.* For this a fuller program is required parallel to and correlated with instruction, day school life, the home, and the playground. This should provide opportunity for organizing ideas through action and for initiative.

5 *Weak Places.* Perhaps the weakest spot in Religious Education is for that period of youth from twelve or fourteen years old upward, especially later adolescence. This is shown by the fact that the Sunday schools and churches lose hold of most of their young people during these years. Moreover, these are years when there is large and growing desire on the part of the pupil to exercise initiative and to organize his ideas into a system, and where churches most of all fail to provide for these things.

THE CITY SUNDAY SCHOOL INSTITUTE

ITS RISE AND DEVELOPMENT*

WALTER S. ATHEARN, M.A.

Professor of Religious Education, Drake University

Six years ago I established the Department of Religious Education in Drake University. It was my conviction then as it is now that such departments in colleges should helpfully relate themselves to the work of religious education in the local field. To this end I formulated an outline for a city system of religious education and prepared in detail the plans for a city training school for Sunday school teachers, as the first step towards the inauguration of a City System of Religious Education.

This proposed City Sunday School Institute was presented to the leading Sunday school workers of the city for consideration. The plan was approved as a "beautiful theory, but impracticable for Des Moines." It was pointed out to me that several attempts to organize union teacher-training classes in Des Moines had failed for lack of interest; that we had no progressive Sunday schools in the city; that the ministers of the city were as a class indifferent to Sunday school matters; that the Polk County Sunday School Association was practically dead; and that the State Sunday School Association after many attempts had given up hope of ever arousing in Des Moines any interest in co-operative efforts in behalf of the Sunday schools of the city.

Failing to get any encouragement from those whose co-operation would be necessary for the success of my plans I filed my outline away for future reference. They remained in my desk an entire year. In the fall of 1911, the Men and Religion Forward Movement team held an eight days' campaign in Des Moines. Supt. Z. C. Thornburg was made chairman of the local committee on religious education. When Supt. Thornburg's appointment was announced I took the plans of the City Sunday School Institute from my desk and went to his office for a conference. We went over the plans in detail and decided to head up the enthusiasm to be created in religious education in the approaching campaign into a permanent night school of religious education for Des Moines. Detailed plans to this end were worked out by Supt. Thornburg and myself before the arrival of the team.

* From the annual report presented by Prof. W. S. Athearn, to the committee of the Des Moines Sunday School Institute. It is published as a clear and helpful statement of the beginning of this valuable activity and of the principles underlying this work.

The Drake University Department of Religious Education made a very elaborate display of modern Sunday school work in the basement of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, and this was made headquarters for the Bible Study conferences conducted daily during the campaign by Rev. Wm. A. Brown, the Bible study expert with the Men and Religion Forward Movement team. On the fourth day of the campaign at the close of a very inspiring conference led by Mr. Brown, Professor F. E. Goodell, as a part of the original plan, moved that a committee of three be appointed to propose some plan by which the enthusiasm generated at these special meetings might be continued after the campaign was over. This motion was unanimously adopted and Z. C. Thornburg, K. H. Guthrie, and F. E. Goodell were named as the committee and asked to report at the close of the Bible Study Conference on the following day. In harmony with instructions this committee presented its report, which was the plan which had been rejected a year before as impracticable. This plan was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted by the conference, and endorsed at a mass meeting of Sunday school workers in the city on the following evening. The original committee was instructed to proceed to organize a City Sunday School Institute in harmony with the provisions of their original report. The result of their work is found in the "First Annual Announcement of the Des Moines Sunday School Institute."

From the foregoing statement it will be seen that the special Bible Study Conferences held by Rev. Wm. A. Brown as a part of the eight days' campaign of the Men and Religion Forward Movement in Des Moines, created the conditions which enabled a few interested people to launch a high grade night school of religious instruction in a city famed for its lack of interest in such matters.

When the enthusiasm created by the special campaign had subsided the Institute found itself launched on a dead sea, and the problem of creating an active interest in the project was one of the most difficult problems which has confronted the director and his co-workers during the past four years, and it remains a problem to tax the strength and patience and resources of those who are to carry on the work in the future. The conditions are now at hand to make the work of the future less taxing than it has been in the past. Des Moines will never know the labor, sacrifice, and real suffering which constitute the "birth-pains" of the Des Moines Sunday School Institute. It is a child of *faith*, of

prayer, of love, and of sacrifice. Its development and growth will call for a continuance of all these elements.

Fundamental Principles

The foundation stones upon which the Des Moines Sunday School Institute rests are the following convictions which I believe to be fundamental:

1. Religious education is an essential factor in the Christianizing of the world.
2. Religious education demands a body of trained religious teachers.
3. The training of the religious teachers of a city is a community problem which can only be solved by co-operative effort.

A City System of Religious Education

The following outline has been from time to time held before the city as a goal towards which we should consciously direct our efforts: 1. A city superintendent of religious education. 2. A city board of religious education. 3. A model school. 4. A common standard. 5. A city institute for the training of religious teachers.

The second, fourth, and fifth items have been introduced. In my judgment the next forward step should be the employment of a trained educator as City Superintendent of Religious Education.

Manual of Methods

The plans, ideals, and methods which have characterized the work of the Institute in the past are set forth in detail in a little volume which has been published by the University of Chicago Press under the title, "The City Institute for Religious Teachers."

Extension of the City Institute Idea

City institutes modeled on the Des Moines plan have been successfully launched in 80 cities as follows:

Colorado, Denver; *Connecticut*, Hartford, Bridgeport, Waterbury, New Britain, New London; *Illinois*, Elgin, Rock Island, Moline, Rock Falls, Sterling, Dixon, Polo, Quincy, Kewanee, Vermont, Alton, Carbondale, Aurora, Decatur, Oak Park, Taylorville, Gibson, Astoria, Waukegan, Champaign, Morrison, Lincoln, Clinton, Springfield, Jacksonville; *Pennsylvania*, Pittsburgh, Connellsville, Brownville; *Virginia*, Norfolk; *Saskatchewan*, Saskatoon; *British Columbia*, Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster; *Indiana*, Indianapolis, Plymouth, Logansport; *Manitoba*, Winnipeg; *Iowa*, Des

Moines, Ottumwa, Marshalltown, Oskaloosa; *Kansas*, Topeka, Atchison, Kansas City; *Kentucky*, Louisville; *Louisiana*, New Orleans, Crowley; *Maryland*, Baltimore; *New Brunswick*, Moncton, St. John; *Maine*, Portland; *New York*, Buffalo, New York City, Schenectady; *Nebraska*, Lincoln; *New Jersey*, Newark, Camden; *Missouri*, St. Louis (two), Kansas City, St. Joseph; *Ohio*, Lima, Akron, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo; *Washington*, Spokane; *Nova Scotia*, Halifax; *Alberta*, Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge; *Hawaii*, Honolulu.

SUNDAY SCHOOL EVANGELISM

WALTER A. SNOW

General Secretary, North Dakota Sunday School Association

On February 25, 1915, I sent the following *questionnaire* to all the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Congregational pastors in North Dakota:

1. At what age did you experience your first religious awakening? 2. Did you make known to any one at that time your desires? 3. At what age did you unite with the church? 4. How young would you receive a child into the church? 5. The statement is being made that 50% of the young people who unite with the church become unfaithful to their vows and are lost to the church; what proportion would you estimate? 6. Do you make a practice of conducting "Pastor's Classes" or "Confirmation Classes?" 7. How long is such a class in training? 8. Book used? 9. How many young people under 20 did you receive into church membership during 1914? 10. Age of youngest? 11. Average age? 12. How many of these received through revival meetings? 13. How many otherwise?

I have received 103 replies. The replies bring forth some very interesting circumstances, and careful analysis of all these reveals

	At Birth	As a Babe	Early Age	3 or 4 years	5 years	6 years	7 years	8 years	9 years	10 years	11 years	12 years	13 years	14 years	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	19 years	20 years	21 years	22 years	23 years	24 years	25 years	26 years	27 years
Q. No. 1.....	8	1	4	5	6	5	13	2	17	8	10	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Q. No. 2.....	8	1	4	5	6	5	13	2	17	8	10	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Q. No. 3.....	2	1	1	2	9	7	18	7	17	11	8	10	3	11	6	5	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Q. No. 4.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

1. Age first religious awakening.
2. Age joining church.
3. Age at which would receive child into church.
4. Age youngest child received in 1914.

some tendencies among the pastors of the present day quite different from those of a generation ago. I will take these questions up by number and give the reports with some comments upon them.

1. "At what age did you experience your first religious awakening?" 103 answers; at four or five years of age, 1; at six, 4; at seven, 5; at eight, 6; at nine, 5; at ten, 13; at eleven, 2; at twelve, 17; at thirteen, 8; at fourteen, 10; at sixteen, 2; at seventeen, 4; at eighteen, 1; at nineteen, 1; at twenty, 1; at twenty-three, 1. Others answered as follows: "Early," 8; "Always considered myself a child of God," 4; "Can't tell," 5; no answer, 2; "About sixteen," 1. In commenting on this it will be necessary to remember that these answers are made by men who are now in mature life. Their early experience of religion is therefore the experience of a generation ago. But it seems to me a remarkable thing that 41 out of the total of 103 said that they had their first religious awakening before twelve years of age, and if we add to this the eight who replied "early" and the four who replied "That they always considered themselves a child of God," we have a total of 55.

Answering question 2. "Did you make known to any one at that time your desires?" 50 replied "yes" and 44 replied "no," which indicates that no conclusion can be drawn as to the tendencies of the child to reveal his awakened religious life. Likewise if we take the number of those who replied that their first religious awakening came before they were thirteen years of age, we find that 27 of these did make known their religious desires to some one and 29 did not make them known, so that it is evident that no conclusion can be drawn regarding the tendencies of young children to express their thoughts concerning religious things. It is, however, an interesting thing to note that several answered this question "Yes, my mother," and that no one of them spoke of having talked with their pastor or their father, although, of course, this was not specifically asked in the *questionnaire*.

Question 3. "At what age did you unite with the church?" elicited some very interesting information: At eight years of age, 4; at ten, 1; at eleven, 4; at twelve, 7; at thirteen, 7; at fourteen, 8; at fifteen, 8; at sixteen, 10; at seventeen, 13; at eighteen, 11; at nineteen, 6; at twenty, 5; at twenty-one, 7; at twenty-three, 6; at twenty-four, 2; at twenty-six, 1; at twenty-seven, 1. It is a significant thing that all but four of these men united with the church before they were twenty-three years of age, and that all but ten had united with the church by the time they were twenty-one, and that eighty-five per cent were in the church before they were twenty.

It is a significant thing to consider the lapse of time between the

age of first awakening and the age at which these men united with the church. The answers range as follows: no time elapsing, 22; one year, 6; two years, 7; three years, 1; four years, 11; five years, 9; six years, 1; seven years, 4; eight years, 3; nine years, 3; ten years, 5; eleven years, 5; and four others ranging from twelve to eighteen years. Of those where no time elapsed between the awakening and uniting with the church we find, as we should expect, that these are cases of conversion at ages where the church has been in the habit of thinking that it was proper to receive them into the church membership.

Answering Question 4, "How young would you receive a child into the church?" and taking into consideration the various answers given as to "why," we have some great surprises. There seems to be a very decided tendency on the part of the pastors to receive children at an early age. There were 103 replies distributed as follows: One replied that he would receive children "three or four years of age and upwards"; 2 replied that they would receive a child at age of five; 9 at age of six; 7 at age of seven; 18 at age of eight; 7 at age of nine; 17 at age of ten; 11 at age of twelve; 3 replied "When converted"; 3 replied "When they understand and desire to unite"; 5 replied "When child desires"; 1 replied "On probation when baptized and into full connection when desired"; 2 replied "At birth"; other replies, "Can't say," "When one can love consciously, obey intelligently, know right from wrong and feel shame for sin," "At baptism," "Always have them on probation and receive into full connection at age twelve," "As a babe," "Early age," "When marks of grace are evident."

From these answers it is very evident that the tendency of thought in these days is to receive a child at an early age. Whether or not the pastors are making very much of an effort to follow out their convictions and to secure the results which they feel are desirable in the lives of children, was not made evident by the questions asked but there is a sidelight thrown upon this by the answers given to question 6, which will be taken up in its turn.

There will also be some interesting sidelights to the answers given to question 10, "What was age of the youngest child which you received into church membership during 1914?" One received a child at age six; 4 at age seven; 4 at age eight; 5 at age nine; 9 at age ten; 5 at age eleven; 10 at age sixteen; 1 at age seventeen. It is evident that the pastors have the courage of their convictions and are receiving children into the church at a very much earlier age than obtained in their own experience as a child.

Question 6. "Do you make a practice of conducting Pastors' Classes or Confirmation Classes?" 103 answers were distributed as follows: 47 answered "Yes"; 15 answered "No"; 10 gave no answer, 2 "Not at present"; 4 "When favorable"; 4 that they used the Junior League for this purpose; 2 "When there is need"; 1 "Use children's church for this purpose"; 1 "Time will not permit."

It is evident from this that the practice of preparing children for church membership by giving special instruction has come to be all but universal. Only fifteen out of the total of 103 answered definitely "No," while ten gave no answer, the reason being that several of the replies came from men who, in 1914, were not in actual pastoral service.

Answers to question 7. "How long is such a class in training?" The time varies from a week with meetings every day to six months and in some cases even a full year with meetings once a week. The average will be between two and three months.

Question 8, "Book used," the following are given: "Coming to the Communion," by Erdman; "Manual for Communicant's Classes," by Miller; "Probationer's Manual," "At the Beautiful Gate of the Church," by Tobie; "Intermediate Catechism."

Answering question 9, "How many young people under 20 did you receive into church membership during 1914?" 55 received varying numbers; 19 replied that they received none, and 27 gave no answer to this question.

Question 5, "The statement is being made that 50 per cent of the young people who unite with the church become unfaithful to their vows and are lost to the church; what proportion would you estimate?" was asked to test the varying opinions of men in different denominations in different parts of the state. Of course, no statistics can be gathered regarding such a subject. It is simply the varying opinions of men, and the answers given show a wide variety of opinions, ranging from 5 per cent to 90 per cent of loss. However, the preponderance of opinion seems to be that the loss is nowhere near 50 per cent. One man estimated the loss from 75 to 90 per cent; 3 at 75 per cent; 1 at 65 per cent; 3 answered "Quite 50 per cent"; 9 thought the loss would be more than 50 per cent; 11 thought "50 per cent too high"; 5 estimated from 30 to 35 per cent; 19 answered "Not to exceed 24 per cent"; 5 estimated a loss of 20 per cent; 14 thought the loss would not be over 10 per cent; 3 estimated it from 5 to 10 per cent; 3 at 5 per cent; 1 answered "Very few"; 1 said, "Can't recall a single case of loss"; while 16 gave no answer to the question.

Regarding the causes of this heavy loss the following were suggested: "Itinerary ministry," "Lack of personal influence," "Indifference on the part of the church to training and keeping young people interested," "Desire and willingness do not always result in change of soul, hence falling away of 75 per cent to 90 per cent," "There is not developed an adequate church consciousness corresponding to the God consciousness," "Bad example," "Failure to understand the child," and, *mirabile dictu*, "Lack of doctrinal preaching!"

It is quite interesting to see the prevailing opinion that the children and young people are more faithful to their church vows than are adults. From a large number of replies along this line, I quote the following: "I have found that the overwhelming number of people who unite with the church between the ages of twelve and twenty are faithful," "I have known very few children to go back if they were properly looked after and rightly instructed and helped," "There is more danger where they do not unite with the church at all." A large number of replies are in spirit like this one, "If properly guided I doubt whether more are lost than of adults," "But the fault lies with the church, not with the child," "Fifty per cent of older people are more likely to be unfaithful than 10 per cent of the children," "This depends upon the care bestowed upon them by the pastor and the church. A great deal more could be conserved by faithful oversight," "I have not found such backsliding of young as indicated above."

The value of such results as are gathered by the *questionnaire* method is, of course, debatable, but at least it indicates a current of thought and in so far is of value. Certain conclusions seem to be very reasonably drawn from the results of the above *questionnaire*. First, there is a decided tendency toward receiving children at an earlier age than in the past generation. Second, there is an overwhelming opinion on the part of the pastors that it is highly desirable from many points of view to receive a child at an early age. Third, that those who are received at this early age develop the best Christian character and are most dependable. Fourth, that careful training and nurture are indispensable in work with children. Fifth, that this nurture and care ought not to cease when once the child is received into the church but should continue along the line of Christian service.

THE ORGANIZATION OF A CHURCH

PAUL MOORE STRAYER

Minister of The Third Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N. Y.

My convictions as to church organization are given at length in a volume entitled "The Reconstruction of the Church with Regard to its Message and Program." I am seeking to work out those convictions so far as they apply to my field. Here I can only mention the more noteworthy results.

First as to the service of worship: I am convinced that in the average church but one service is required on Sunday for Christian culture. The second service should be for propagandic purposes, to win recruits to the church and to make disciples for Christ. As ours is a neighborhood church, too far from the center of the city to reach the non-churchgoer, we have had one preaching service in the church on Sunday, and during part of the winter a theater meeting down town which aims especially to reach non-churchgoers. The "People's Sunday Evening," as we call it, is a public forum definitely religious but evangelistic only in the broadest sense. We discuss all questions, social, industrial, moral, and personal, which have a real bearing on life and which are related to the Kingdom of God. The meetings are managed by a committee of fifteen made up of men from various walks in life and of various points of view; three are labor leaders and only half of them are members of my church. Associated with me is Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, of the Baptist Theological Seminary, and we two are known as ministers of the P. S. E.

A distinctive and original enterprise of the church is its Social Service Department, under the lead of a trained social worker. We do work corresponding to that of charity organization societies, only better, because apart from those referred to us by members of the church we take only selected cases and turn the others over to the United Charities, with which we always co-operate. Men and women of the church are asked to serve on Committees of Family Rehabilitation which meet each week for a semester of ten weeks. The secretary investigates a family which needs relief and lays the facts before the committee who, with her, decide on the best plans for restoring the family to self support and self respect. This is not only a means of educating the congregation in big human problems, of which many of them had never heard before, but of rendering relief of permanent value. From thirty to fifty individuals or

families are under treatment all the while, with the help of from twenty to thirty friendly visitors who call from week to week at the homes involved. A large majority of the church's membership have been enlisted in the work of this department in one way or another.

The Social Service Department is the main organization within the church which is worthy of note. This is chiefly because I do not feel we ought to try to restrict church people to definite church activities. I emphasize constantly that "church work" is not confined to the church organization but that it includes whatever one does in his business, in his personal relationships, or in any other agency of the city which makes the common life better and happier and helps to bring in the Kingdom. As the result there is not an agency at work for the common good in which one or more members of the church are not moving spirits, and there are few in the church who are not engaged in some disinterested service.

THE CHURCH OF THE DISCIPLES, BOSTON

The Lend a Hand Club associated with the Disciples School at the Church of the Disciples, Boston, Mass., has recently given a very delightful performance of Alfred R. Gaul's cantata of "Ruth." It is a great thing to direct the dramatic instincts of young people into paths that give vent to the Spirit, and lead to new reservoirs of power. There is no lovelier way of binding the young people of the church at a time in their lives when conflicting interests annoy and sometimes mislead. The Book of Ruth with its exquisite treatment of intimate relations, the choice language, and its high ideals, makes a profound impression. Sufficient dramatic action was introduced through the skill of one of the young performers to make the story live once more. The chorus was trained by the organist of the church, who received extra compensation, and who was unwearied in his labors to bring the performance to a high degree of perfection.

The last scene was like a religious service. The young people in the chorus—the reapers and the gleaners—standing with bowed heads, as Boaz and Ruth, attended by Naomi, receive the benediction of the Elder. Then the chorus breaks forth, jubilantly "Rejoice, Rejoice, for blessings round us fall!" The influence of such a scene can not fail to go on in the lives of the performers. Dignity and

beauty elevated the actions of all, raising them far above the crude manners which too frequently attend in real life the bridal festivities of the present day. The audience, too, was raised to an appreciation beyond applause.

It was pleasant to have this work bring such great spiritual reward, and to know that in addition to the joy of it all a good sum of money was raised for charitable purposes.

A Home Department in the Home and School Conference connected with the Disciples School has proved helpful to the mothers of young children. Memory work is given out each month for the mothers to commit while about their work.

God help us mothers all to live aright,
And may our homes all love and truth enfold,
Since life for us no loftier aim can hold
Than leading little children to the light.

A recital, bringing together all the pupils who can play creditably any kind of musical instrument, has made a happy afternoon for parents and children. Such a concert unites the young people in the mutual appreciation of high endeavors. It strengthens and elevates the spirit of comradeship, which after such encouragement appears in new fervor in the religious services. It is good to open many avenues to the life of the Spirit, that the approach may be natural, free and joyous.

At the annual meeting of the church in April the work of the Disciples School and of the various organizations connected with it are reported. The young people have a place on the program and report their work with their elders with equal acceptance. The reports are printed and form a part of the church history.

CLARA B. BEATLEY,
Chairman Com. on Education.

SUNDAY SCHOOL EXAMINATIONS AND CERTIFICATE

The following are the examination questions asked of the pupils of the fourth year high school grade in the Union School of Religion, the Sunday school of Union Theological Seminary. It will be noted that the questions are given out on three successive Sundays.

U. S. R. FINAL EXAMINATION, PART I. 18 April, 1915.

Take as long as you like. Use note book paper. Hand in next Sunday. Bibles may be used for (1). Use any help you like for (7). Answer all others independently.

1. Think over what you have studied about the Bible in the Union School of Religion or elsewhere, and then answer these questions:

- a. What is the significance of the Bible for us?
- b. Mention six or seven characters of the Bible that stand out in your mind above all others, giving your reasons for selecting just these.
- c. Outline the life of Jesus, giving only significant details.
- d. In what books is this information found?
- e. What influence did Jesus have upon his own times? What is the significance of Jesus for men and women to-day?

2. What does the expression "the Kingdom of God" mean to you?

3. What is your idea of society and its possibilities when it follows the teachings of Jesus?

4. What is of most worth in life? Illustrate, if you care to, from the teachings of Jesus.

5. If you know anyone who seems to you to fulfill the Christian ideal more perfectly than anyone else, describe him or her in such a way as to show the reasons for your estimate.

6. Imagine yourself multiplied over many, so that you are actually "society." Then examine "your" conduct and see if it will be good or evil. Be specific.

7. Discuss the following problems from the Christian point of view;

- a. Is war justifiable?
- b. What are the rights of the child?
- c. Unemployment.
- d. Point out, from the Christian point of view, the reasons for or against

Mr. Osborne's methods of dealing with prisoners.

e. What do you think of the Ford experiment in profit sharing?

f. Describe any other current problems that involve Christian principles.

NOTE: Answer as many as you like under No. 7.

U. S. R. FINAL EXAMINATION, PART II. 25 April, 1915.

Take as long as you like. Use note book paper. Hand in next Sunday. Answer all questions independently.

8. What is education for?

9. What is the Christian standard of morality in regard to relations between sexes?

10. What is the Christian standard of morality in regard to relations between:

- a. Employers and employed?
- b. Weak and strong?
- c. Rich and poor?
- d. Good persons and bad persons
- e. Between equals?
- f. Between nations?

NOTE: Answer as many as you like under No. 10.

11. Describe the sort of family and of family life that you would call Christian.
12. Why should one join the church?
13. How would you decide whether or not any particular form of recreation or amusement were right? E.g., dancing, baseball, movies, football, etc., etc.
14. When one has done wrong, what should he do about it?
15. What did Jesus teach concerning the effects of wrong-doing? If you cannot state what He taught, give your own ideas.
16. Show what seems to you to be the Christian idea concerning:
 - a. The nature of God.
 - b. The relation between God and men.
 - c. The destiny of men.

U. S. R. FINAL EXAMINATION, PART III. 2 May, 1915.

To be answered thoughtfully but not handed in.

1. Have you any purpose in life which is greater than all other purposes? What is it?
2. Can you recall instances in your own life in which this supreme purpose, or some other, has influenced your conduct or plans or hopes, or helped you to make some decisions?
3. Do you accept the ideals of Jesus and desire to be one of His acknowledged followers?
4. If you care to, hand in, in a few words, a description of one or two experiments in which you have felt God's presence in your life.
5. Think back over the week's schedule which you made out, and point out to yourself how the things you did or planned or thought or felt were or were not in harmony with Christian ways and ideals.
6. Do you support the church in any way? Just how?
7. What is your serious intention with regard to how you will relate yourself to the church in the future?

Having answered these questions, and those which you handed in, do you now feel that you are fitted to assume the responsibilities of a citizen of the Kingdom of God? If so, declare so in writing and mail your declaration to the principal.

NOTE: The evidence on which fitness for graduation is decided is of these kinds:

1. The personal knowledge of the teacher as to the candidate's manner of life and his ability to live in accordance with Christian principles of action.
2. The examination of the candidate as to the knowledge and appreciation of Christian ideals and ways of life.
3. The candidate's estimate of his own practice and purpose with reference to the Kingdom of God.

The final decision will be based on all these matters and will not be made by reference to any single line of evidence.

The blank which the teachers fill out is as follows:

U. S. R. FINAL EXAMINATION, PART IV. 2 May, 1915.

TEACHER'S TESTIMONY

Teacher: Pupil:

I. Think over each pupil with reference to the following items, using any evidence you can gather, and commenting on each item as you see fit:

1. Knowledge and appreciation of Christian ideals and ways of life.
2. Ability to live in accordance with Christian principles of action.
3. Participation in the worship, work, and fellowship of the Christian community.
4. Supreme purpose concerning the use to be made of life.

II. Then state your opinion as to the candidate's fitness to assume the responsibilities of a citizen of the Kingdom of God.

The certificate given to the pupil reads as follows:

THE UNION SCHOOL OF RELIGION
maintained by the
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Broadway at 120th Street
NEW YORK

BE IT KNOWN THAT.....
having been a member of the School for — years, has been examined both by himself and by his teachers in the following regards:

Knowledge and appreciation of Christian ideals and ways of life; Ability to live in accordance with Christian principles of action; Participation in the worship, work, and fellowship of the Christian community; Supreme purpose concerning the use to be made of life, and is deemed by himself and by his teachers to be fitted to assume the responsibilities of a citizen of the Kingdom of God.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, these signatures are attached to this diploma.

May, 191..

.....
Teacher, Fourth Year High School.

.....
Principal of the Union School of Religion.

.....
Head of the Department of Religious Education.

[SEAL]

.....
President of the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary.

Concerning the plan the principal of the school, Professor H. H. Hartshorn, says: The examination of the candidates for graduation from the fourth year high school grade was given out in three parts on three successive Sundays just before the close of the year, viz., April 18 and 25 and May 2. The purpose of the examination is expressed in the diploma and in the note at the end of Part III of the examination. It is a vital part of the process of education, affording a means by which the candidate's ideas and purposes may be brought to more definite focus. It is also a test by which the candidate can gain more adequate knowledge of himself than he is apt to have had before, and can thereby make a more intelligent consecration of his own life. It is, finally, a means of gaining evi-

dence concerning the candidate's fitness to graduate. Part III is definitely a self-examination, and is intended to assist the candidate to decide for himself whether or not he thinks he is able to assume the responsibilities of full citizenship in the Kingdom of God. In Part IV, which is the teacher's testimony, the same matters are gone over from a different angle. All these things, together with the pupil's record in the school, are taken into consideration in deciding fitness to graduate.

The answers to the questions confirmed the teacher's independent estimate in each case. They were written at home under the conditions described at the beginning of each paper. Some were of a high order of excellence, showing maturity of judgment and originality of thought. All gave splendid evidence of sincerity, open-mindedness, and Christian discipleship.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

At the Panama-Pacific Exposition the days from August 16 to September 5 are devoted to international congresses on education, and the dates August 27-29 to a special program prepared and conducted by the Religious Education Association, as follows:

Theme, "RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE NEW
WORLD ORDER"

Meetings in the Oakland City Auditorium

Friday Morning, August 27th

The Sunday School as a School of Life.

Rev. J. W. F. Davies, Winnetka, Ill.

Rev. H. B. Mowbray, San Bernardino, Cal.

Rev. J. A. Baber, Long Beach, Cal.

Friday Afternoon, August 27th

Addresses of welcome.

President Benjamin Ide Wheeler.

Bishop William F. Nichols.

Intellectual Emancipation of College Students.

Pres. Wm. T. Foster, Reed College, Portland, Ore.

Religious Leadership for the Future.

Dr. Samuel A. Eliot, President, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.

Friday Night, August 27th*Joint Meeting with the N.E.A.*

Education for World Living.

*President H. C. King, LL.D., Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.***Saturday Morning, August 28th**

Contribution of the Public Schools to Religious Progress.

*Dr. Henry F. Cope, Chicago.**Prof. C. E. Rugh, University of California.**Miss Margaret A. Slattery, Boston.***Saturday Afternoon, August 28th**

Parallels of Progress in Religion and Education.

President Chas. F. Thwing, LL.D., Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

The College Student and World Living.

*President W. B. Bizzell, A. & M. College of Texas.**Rev. J. W. F. Davies, Winnetka, Ill.***Saturday Night, August 28th**

Christianity and the War.

President Joseph Swain, LL.D., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Religious Education and Modern Oriental Problems.

*Sidney L. Gulick, Kyoto, Japan.***Sunday Afternoon, August 29th**

Meaning of the War to Modern Education.

*Chancellor David Starr Jordan, Stanford University, Cal.***Sunday Night, August 29th**

The Responsibility of the State for Spiritual Ideals.

President A. Ross Hill, LL.D., University of Missouri.

The Fundamental Religious Element in Universal Education.

Hon. P. P. Claxton, Ph.D., U. S. Commissioner of Education.

These meetings will be held in the beautiful municipal auditorium of Oakland. Those who expect to attend are advised to make early reservations at one of the following hotels in Oakland: The Oakland, Harrison, Menlo, St. Mark's, Key Route Inn, or at the Shattuck Hotel in Berkeley.

The series of congresses, which will last three weeks, afford an unusual opportunity for all persons interested in education. The meetings of the National Education Association will be held from

August 16-26; the Religious Education Association, August 27-29; National Association of State Universities, August 30-31; and various other related educational organizations during this same period.

THE COMMISSION ON GRADED WORSHIP

The Commission on Graded Worship is just completing its third year of investigation. The results of its work have been published from time to time in *Religious Education*. During the last year several meetings of the Commission have been held and the individual members have devoted themselves to a study of the problems suggested at the last meeting of the Religious Education Association.

If the results of the Commission's work during these three years, and especially during the last year, seem surprisingly meagre, the members of the Commission have only this to say: They have become increasingly aware of the fact that here is a vast field of religious experience which has had hitherto very little scientific investigation. Moreover the very nature of the subject is such as to baffle the investigator at every point and render his conclusions uncertain. Worship is largely an expression of feeling, and feelings are more or less vague, resisting analysis. The study of worship is very much like the study of life itself—the moment one thrusts the scalpel into the living tissue the life departs, and the observer can never feel quite sure that what he now looks upon is really the vital process.

In spite of these difficulties the Commission however do feel that some conclusions have been reached which may be helpful as a basis for further study. They would offer the following statement of principles:

1. The need for worship is universal and persists throughout the whole of life.
2. The nature of worship is essentially the same in the child and in the adult.
3. The order of common worship as a whole and in detail should be adapted to the needs, interests, and capacities of the worshippers.
4. The extent to which the individual worshiper participates in a service of worship depends upon the degree to which the service as a whole and in detail is adapted to his needs, interests, and capacity.

5. The extent of participation on the part of the group as a whole in a service of worship depends upon the degree to which the elements of the service are adapted to the needs, interests, and capacities common to the group.

6. The content of an order of worship should be determined by the nature and size of the worshipping group for which it is intended and by the range of their experience.

7. If special needs are to be met through an order of worship, the worshipping group should be reduced in size to include only those to whom such needs are common.

The following problems were also proposed for general discussion:

I. Worship and Instruction:

1. Should the children's service of worship precede or follow the class session? From what principle?
2. What is the relation of the material of worship to the material of instruction?

II. The Conduct of Worship:

1. Who should lead the worship of the school? Pastor, superintendent, or teachers?
2. What part should pupils have in the conduct of the school worship?

III. Worship for Different Ages:

1. What should be the nature of worship for small children, i.e., under 10 years? Hymns, prayers, responses or memory passages of Scripture, order or sequence of parts?
2. What should be the nature of worship for boys and girls, from 10 to 16 years of age? Hymns, prayers, responses or memory passages of Scripture, order or sequence of parts?
3. What special adaptations are needed for adolescents: below 16 years? above 16 years?
4. How far is it necessary to provide separately for these needs in special groups of worshippers?

IV. What relation should worship in the Sunday school sustain to the regularly appointed worship of the church?

V. What is the relation between worship and conduct?

SUMMER SCHOOLS

Classes, lectures, and conferences on different aspects of Religious Education are represented to an increased degree in the summer assemblies this year. A very strong program in the Department of Religion is given all through the season at Chautauqua, N. Y., where the special work in Religious Education is given by Miss Georgia L. Chamberlin, and lectures by Dean Shailer Mathews, Dr. Jesse Hurlbut, and Rev. Milton S. Littlefield.

At Teachers' College, Professor Walter S. Athearn gives special lectures on the principles and methods of Religious Education. The summer session is held in connection with the Union Theological Seminary.

At the University of Chicago two special institutes are given in the summer quarter, running from June 28th to July 9th, with lectures by Drs. Theodore G. Soares, Allen Hoben, and Henry F. Cope.

Pacific Theological Seminary has a strong summer course with lectures in Religious Education given by Professor Charles E. Rugh and Dr. Henry F. Cope. Other lectures include Dr. Warren H. Wilson, Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, and Professor William F. Bade. The session lasts from June 21st to July 31st.

At Kalamazoo College, Michigan, an institute is held under the leadership of Rev. Orlo J. Price, with special lectures on the work of the Sunday school and other aspects of Religious Education.

Courses in the Sunday school are given at the following summer institutes: Northfield, Mass., July 18 to 25; Asbury Park, N. J., July 7 to 14; Narragansett Pier, R. I., July 11 to 18; Frankfort, Mich., August 19 to 26; Baton Rouge, La., July 15 to 24. Preachers' Institute at Fayette, Mo., includes lectures by Dr. Herbert L. Willett, Dr. Shailer Mathews, and Dr. Henry F. Cope. Work in Religious Education is also given at Biloxi, Miss., and Rock Hill, South Carolina.

We call attention to an error in the June issue regarding the pamphlet, "How to Study the Old Testament." It is not for free distribution as announced, but for sale by Chas. Scribner's Sons at 25 cents net for paper, 50 cents net for cloth.

NOTES

A special committee of the Commission on Christian Education in the Federal Council of Churches has prepared a course of study for Sunday schools on "International Peace." The lessons have been designed for adult classes and have been prepared by Prof. N. E. Richardson.

All persons interested in the various methods of accredited Bible teaching in relation to public schools should send for Bulletin No. 4, of the Commission of Moral and Religious Education of the Northern Baptist Convention. This is published for free distribution by the American Baptist Publication Society, 1701 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.

The Training Institute of the New York City Sunday School Association had an average attendance of nearly 200 during the season of twenty-four weeks that closed in May. The Association has now adopted a plan for a three year's training course that involves attendance at seventy-two lecture periods and seventy-two class periods.

The missionary schools which are in the territory of the Japanese government are meeting the serious problems arising out of the present policy of that government as to teaching religion in schools. All education is regarded as the function of the state so that even private schools must have government permits, must make regular reports and submit themselves to government regulations. The present tendency is opposed to teaching religion in the schools, and Japanese educators are greatly interested in the study of education without formal religious instruction in the United States.

Thirty Vacation Bible Schools are being conducted by Presbyterian churches in Chicago. The sessions began July 6 and will continue for six weeks. Rev. W. Clyde Smith, superintendent of the Social Service Department of Presbyterian Church Extension, says the plan is to continue worship and play. The first period of each service is occupied with singing, the telling of a Bible story, and a talk on "habits." During the second period boys and girls are taught to make baskets, hammocks, toys, and leather articles. The older girls are taught to sew. Children of all nationalities and beliefs are enrolled. At the close of each day's session the children gather about the United States flag and sing America, after which they repeat the words: "I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the republic for which it stands: one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

BOOK REVIEWS

ELEMENTS OF RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY. *Fred Lewis Pattee.* (Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee, Wis., 75c.) This excellent textbook has been in use for several years and is one of the very few which, being prepared especially for Sunday school teachers, treats its subjects with dignity and seriousness. Altogether a good advanced textbook, modern and inclusive.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO SERMONS. *Members of the University Faculties.* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, \$1.50 net.) A most unusual volume of sermons. Valuable not alone as illustrating the modern type of sermon, but also as indicating the religious resources of a great university and the elements of interest and freshness in modern pulpit messages. The volume includes sermons by eighteen representative men with a valuable introductory essay by Dr. Soares. The sermon on death by Prof. George B. Foster is alone worth many times the cost of the book.

MAKING THE MOST OF ONE'S MIND. *John Adams, LL.D.* (George H. Doran Co., New York City, \$1.00 net.) Those who remember Todd's "Student's Manual" will welcome this book, which renders the same service to students of to-day. It is equally valuable to private students and to all who seek practical direction in self-culture.

METHODS OF TEACHING. Jewish History, Senior Grade. *Edward N. Calisch, Ph.D.* (Jewish Chautauqua Society, Philadelphia.) The Jewish Chautauqua Society is developing a fine series of textbooks for the Sunday school. This is a teachers' book on later Hebrew history, designed for senior grades.

METHODS OF TEACHING. Pedagogy Applied to Religious Instruction. *David E. Weglein.* (Jewish Chautauqua Society, Philadelphia.) Another indication of the advance being made in the Hebrew schools of religion. A textbook for teachers which while simple and practical is based upon wide reading and an understanding of the modern point of view.

INCH LIBRARY. (Y. W. C. A., New York City, 50c.) A series of nine leaflets in a box, consisting of short messages on problems and ideals in religious life. Prepared especially for girls and young women and including much excellent and very helpful material.

SCHOOL GIRL IDEALS. *Marion Rider and Eliza R. Butler.* (Y. W. C. A., New York City, 10c.) Prepared for high-school girls' clubs. Short discussions and chapters on ethics and opportunities of the girl's life.

THE CALL OF THE NEW DAY TO THE OLD CHURCH. *Charles Stelzle.* (Fleming H. Revell Co., New York City, 25c net.) Frankly recognizes the present-day questioning as to the function

of the church and indicates briefly its new opportunity in social leadership and usefulness.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY EDUCATION? *J. Welton.* (Macmillan & Co., New York City, \$1.60 net.) This is one of the books of the year in the field of education and one of the great books which every student of religious and moral education ought to read. It is written in a charming style and every page gives evidence of the author's wide and generous scholarship. His first position is that the end which is sought will determine the methods and character of educational processes. He has in mind the broadest conception of education as the synthesis of all the agencies and means which aim at complete personality. "The end of education is the development of full and effective human personality—i.e., a life in full and admirable relation to the universe." The author uses the term personality to include what we usually mean by character. Education is the development of the spiritually free personality which is yet determined by the personal environment in which it is found. Man is a being straining forward toward the attainment of personality so that his life is not only material but moral and social and, yet more, religious. This position leads the author to evaluate the activities of life according to spiritual standards, according to their higher effects in man's ability to enter into the life of reverence and love and service. This point of view makes the book all the way through a treatise on religious education. He says, "Religious education is primarily concerned with an attitude of mind—a direction of the will and a trend of the emotions—and to this instruction of the intellect is auxiliary. Nothing but disappointment and failure can ensue from a confusion of the two questions of training or education and instruction, whether it be in religion, in morality, or in general activity. It is because schools so often have made the confusion, and believed they were educating when they were merely instructing, that they so frequently and for such long periods failed to meet the legitimate requirements of the community." All through there is a frank abandonment of the one time dominant purely physiological basis of psychology and the materialistic and mechanically efficient aims in education. The early part of the book is occupied by the spiritual principles, the philosophy of education from the viewpoint of the idealist. The latter part of the book is concerned with the means and agents of education. The author views the school as the meeting-point between the family life and national life, as an extension of the home circle and a miniature of social life. He believes that the school must carry forward the interests and sympathies of the family and both institutions must join their forces. The treatment of the moral training in the school as integral to all its work is most interesting. All together this is a refreshing and inspiring book.

The Next Convention

THE next general convention of The Religious Education Association will be held at Oakland, California, August 27th to 29th.

Theme: "Religious Education and the New World Order."

A very strong program has been arranged; see page 391 of this issue.

Brown University Courses in **Religious Education**

Training of Directors of Religious Education, Lay Assistants of Pastors, Teachers of the Bible, and other leaders in Religious Work.

Co-operation with Religious Organizations of the City and State for practical training.

Special Two-Year Course; Courses for regular, graduate and undergraduate students. For information, address

Professor HENRY THATCHER FOWLER, Providence, R. I.

Hymns of Worship and Service for the Sunday School

**Rich in Hymns of Praise,
of the Spiritual Awakening and Developing
Life, and of Service to Others**

586 pages—every one practical. 300 Hymns, Tunes, Chants, and Responses. 54 pages of Sunday School Choir Selections. 32 pages of Special Services.

Introductory price, 30 cents, F. O. B. New York

Send for sample copy and a complete list of our Hymn-books
for Church, Prayer-Meeting, Sunday School,
College and School

The Century Co.

353 Fourth Avenue

New York City

Bible Study Text Books

For College Curriculum Classes

The Publishers take pleasure in announcing the following texts which have been prepared on the basis of the report of the Joint Commission on College Curriculum and Bible, adopted at the Cleveland Convention of the R. E. A. and fully outlined in *Religious Education* for December, 1913.

NOW READY

New Testament History \$1.50 net

By HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL, President of Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colo.

The Bible as Literature: An Introduction \$1.50 net

By Professors IRVING F. WOOD and ELIHU GRANT of Smith College.

Old Testament History

By Professor ISMAR J. PERITZ, Syracuse University.

The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible

By Professor THEODORE G. SOARES, Univ. of Chicago.

IN PREPARATION

Ready at the opening of the College Year 1915-1916

The History and Principles of Religious Education

By Professor F. H. SWIFT, University of Minnesota.

Correspondence Solicited

THE ABINGDON PRESS

New York	Cincinnati	Chicago
150 Fifth Avenue	220 West 4th Street	1018-24 S. Wabash Ave.
Boston	Pittsburgh	Kansas City
581 Boylston St.	21 Adams St., East	105 Fifth Ave.
		1121 McGee St.
		San Francisco
		5-7 City Hall Ave.

Order from the Nearest Address

